Old South Leaflets.

The United States in the Nineteenth Century.

E 301
.U58
Copy 1

Old South Meeting House, Boston

1900

THE

OLD SOUTH LEAFLETS.

EIGHTEENTH SERIES,

1900.

BOSTON:
OLD SOUTH MEETING HOUSE.
1900.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

INTRODUCTION

THE OLD SOUTH LEAFLETS were prepared primarily for circulation among the attendants upon the Old South Lectures for Young People. The subjects of the Leaflets are immediately related to the subjects of the lectures, and they are intended to supplement the lectures and stimulate historical interest and inquiry among the young people. They are made up, for the most part, from original papers of the periods treated in the lectures, in the hope to make the men and the public life of the periods more clear and real.

The Old South Lectures for Young People were instituted in the summer of 1883, as a means of promoting a more serious and intelligent attention to historical studies, especially studies in American history among the young people of Boston. The success of the lectures has been so great as to warrant the hope that such courses may be sustained in many other cities of the country.

The Old South Lectures for 1883, intended to be strictly upon subjects in early Massachusetts History, but by certain necessities somewhat modified, were as follows: "Governor Bradford and Governor Winthrop," by EDWIN D. MEAD. "Plymouth," by MRS. A. M. DIAZ. "Concord," by FRANK B. SANBORN. "The Town-meeting," by PROF. JAMES K. HOSMER. "Franklin, the Boston Boy," by GEORGE M. TOWLE. "How to study American History," by PROF. G. STANLEY HALL. "The Year 1777," by JOHN FISKE. "History in the Boston Streets," by EDWARD EVERETT HALE. The Leaflets prepared in connection with these lectures consisted of (1) Cotton Mather's account of Governor Bradford, from the "Magnalia"; (2) the account of the arrival of the Pilgrims at Cape Cod from Bradford's Journal; (3) an extract from Emerson's Concord Address in 1835; (4) extracts from Emerson, Samuel Adams, De Tocqueville, and others, upon the Town-meeting; (5) a portion of Franklin's Autobiography; (6) Carlyle on the Study of History; (7) an extract from Charles Sumner's oration upon Lafayette, etc.; (8) Emerson's poem, "Boston."

The lectures for 1884 were devoted to men representative of certain epochs or ideas in the history of Boston, as follows: "Sir Harry Vane, in New England and in Old England," by EDWARD EVERETT HALE, JR. "John Harvard, and the Founding of Harvard College," by EDWARD CHANNING, PH.D. "The Mather Family, and the Old Boston Ministers," by REV. SAMUEL J. BARROWS. "Simon Bradstreet, and the Struggle for the Charter," by PROF. MARSHALL S. SNOW. "Samuel Adams and the Beginning of the Revolution," by PROF. JAMES K. HOSMER. "Josiah Quincy, the Great Mayor," by CHARLES W. SLACK. "Daniel Webster, the Defender of the Constitution," by CHARLES C. COFFIN. "John A. Andrew, the great War Governor," by COL. T. W. HIGGINSON. The Leaflets prepared in connection with the second course were as follows: (1) Selections from Forster's essay on Vane, etc.; (2) an extract from Cotton Mather's "Sal Gentium"; (3) Increase Mather's "Narrative of the Miseries of New England"; (4) an original account of "The Revolution in New England" in 1689; (5) a letter from Samuel Adams to John

Adams, on Republican Government; (6) extracts from Josiah Quincy's Boston Address of 1830; (7) Words of Webster; (8) a portion of Governor Andrew's Address to the Massachusetts Legislature in January, 1861.

The lectures for 1885 were upon "The War for the Union," as follows: "Slavery," by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, JR. "The Fall of Sumter," by COL. T. W. HIGGINSON. "The Monitor and the Merrimac," by CHARLES C. COFFIN. "The Battle of Gettysburg," by COL. THEODORE A. DODGE. "Sherman's March to the Sea," by GEN. WILLIAM COGSWELL. "The Sanitary Commission," by MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE. "Abraham Lincoln," by HON. JOHN D. LONG. "General Grant," by CHARLES C. COFFIN. The Leaflets accompanying these lectures were as follows: (1) Lowell's "Present Crisis," and Garrison's Salutatory in the *Liberator* of January 1, 1831; (2) extract from Henry Ward Beecher's oration at Fort Sumter in 1865; (3) contemporary newspaper accounts of the engagement between the Monitor and the Merrimac; (4) extract from Edward Everett's address at the consecration of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, with President Lincoln's address; (5) extract from General Sherman's account of the March to the Sea, in his Memoirs; (6) Lowell's "Commemoration Ode"; (7) extract from Lincoln's First Inaugural Address, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Second Inaugural Address; (8) account of the service in memory of General Grant, in Westminster Abbey, with Archdeacon Farrar's address.

The lectures for 1886 were upon "The War for Independence," as follows: "Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry," by EDWIN D. MEAD. "Bunker Hill, and the News in England," by JOHN FISKE. "The Declaration of Independence," by JAMES MACALLISTER. "The Times that tried Men's Souls," by ALBERT B. HART, PH.D. "Lafayette, and Help from France," by PROF. MARSHALL S. SNOW. "The Women of the Revolution," by MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE. "Washington and his Generals," by GEORGE M. TOWLE. "The Lessons of the Revolution for these Times," by REV. BROOKE HERFORD. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Words of Patrick Henry; (2) Lord Chatham's Speech, urging the removal of the British troops from Boston; (3) extract from Webster's oration on Adams and Jefferson; (4) Thomas Paine's "Crisis," No. 1; (5) extract from Edward Everett's eulogy on Lafayette; (6) selections from the Letters of Abigail Adams; (7) Lowell's "Under the Old Elm"; (8) extract from Whipple's essay on "Washington and the Principles of the Revolution."

The course for the summer of 1887 was upon "The Birth of the Nation," as follows: "How the men of the English Commonwealth planned Constitutions," by PROF. JAMES K. HOSMER. "How the American Colonies grew together," by JOHN FISKE. "The Confusion after the Revolution," by DAVIS R. DEWEY, PH.D. "The Convention and the Constitution," by HON. JOHN D. LONG. "James Madison and his Journal," by PROF. E. B. ANDREWS. "How Patrick Henry opposed the Constitution," by HENRY L. SOUTHWICK. "Alexander Hamilton and the *Federalist*." "Washington's Part and the Nation's First Years," by EDWARD EVERETT HALE. The Leaflets prepared for these lectures were as follows: (1) Extract from Edward Everett Hale's lecture on "Puritan Politics in England and New England"; (2) "The English Colonies in America," extract from De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America"; (3) Washington's Circular Letter to the Governors of the States on Disbanding the Army; (4) the Constitution of the United States; (5) "The Last Day of the Constitutional Convention," from Madison's Journal; (6) Patrick

Henry's First Speech against the Constitution, in the Virginia Convention; (7) the *Federalist*, No. IX.; (8) Washington's First Inaugural Address.

The course for the summer of 1888 had the general title of "The Story of the Centuries," the several lectures being as follows: "The Great Schools after the Dark Ages," by EPHRAIM EMERTON, Professor of History in Harvard University. "Richard the Lion-hearted and the Crusades," by MISS NINA MOORE, author of "Pilgrims and Puritans." "The World which Dante knew," by SHATTUCK O. HARTWELL, Old South first prize essayist, 1883. "The Morning Star of the Reformation," by REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM. "Copernicus and Columbus, or the New Heaven and the New Earth," by PROF. EDWARD S. MORSE. "The People for whom Shakespeare wrote," by CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER. "The Puritans and the English Revolution," by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE, Professor of History in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "Lafayette and the Two Revolutions which he saw," by GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE.

The Old South Lectures are devoted primarily to American history. But it is a constant aim to impress upon the young people the relations of our own history to English and general European history. It was hoped that the glance at some striking chapters in the history of the last eight centuries afforded by these lectures would be a good preparation for the great anniversaries of 1889, and give the young people a truer feeling of the continuity of history. In connection with the lectures the young people were requested to fix in mind the following dates, observing that in most instances the date comes about a decade before the close of the century. An effort was made in the Leaflets for the year to make dates, which are so often dull and useless to young people, interesting, significant, and useful.— 11th Century: Lanfranc, the great mediæval scholar, who studied law at Bologna, was prior of the monastery of Bec, the most famous school in France in the 11th century, and archbishop of Canterbury under William the Conqueror, died **1089**. 12th Cent.: Richard I. crowned **1189**. 13th Cent.: Dante, at the battle of Campaldino, the final overthrow of the Ghibellines in Italy, **1289**. 14th Cent.: Wyclif died, **1384**. 15th Cent.: America discovered, **1492**. 16th Cent.: Spanish Armada, **1588**. 17th Cent.: William of Orange lands in England, **1688**. 18th Cent.: Washington inaugurated, and the Bastile fell, **1789**. The Old South Leaflets for 1888, corresponding with the several lectures, were as follows: (1) "The Early History of Oxford," from Green's "History of the English People,"; (2) "Richard Cœur de Lion and the Third Crusade," from the Chronicle of Geoffrey de Vinsauf; (3) "The Universal Empire," passages from Dante's *De Monarchia;* (4) "The Sermon on the Mount," Wyclif's translation; (5) "Copernicus and the Ancient Astronomers," from Humboldt's "Cosmos"; (6) "The Defeat of the Spanish Armada," from Camden's "Annals"; (7) "The Bill of Rights," 1689; (8) "The Eve of the French Revolution," from Carlyle. The selections are accompanied by very full historical and bibliographical notes, and it is hoped that the series will prove of much service to students and teachers engaged in the general survey of modern history.

The year 1889 being the centennial both of the beginning of our own Federal government and of the French Revolution, the lectures for the year, under the general title of "America and France," were devoted entirely to subjects in which the history of America is related to that of France as follows: "Champlain, the Founder of Quebec," by CHARLES C. COFFIN. "La Salle and the French in the Great West," by REV.

W. E. GRIFFIS. "The Jesuit Missionaries in America," by PROF. JAMES K. HOSMER. "Wolfe and Montcalm: The Struggle of England and France for the Continent," by JOHN FISKE. "Franklin in France," by GEORGE M. TOWLE. "The Friendship of Washington and Lafayette," by MRS. ABBA GOOLD WOOLSON. "Thomas Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase," by ROBERT MORSS LOVETT, Old South prize essayist, 1888. "The Year 1789," by REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE. The Leaflets for the year were as follows: (1) Verrazzano's account of his Voyage to America; (2) Marquette's account of his Discovery of the Mississippi; (3) Mr. Parkman's Histories; (4) the Capture of Quebec, from Parkman's "Conspiracy of Pontiac"; (5) selections from Franklin's Letters from France; (6) Letters of Washington and Lafayette; (7) the Declaration of Independence; (8) the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, 1789.

The lectures for the summer of 1890 were on "The American Indians," as follows: "The Mound Builders," by PROF. GEORGE H. PERKINS. "The Indians whom our Fathers Found," by GEN. H. B. CARRINGTON. "John Eliot and his Indian Bible," by REV. EDWARD G. PORTER. "King Philip's War," by MISS CAROLINE C. STECKER, Old South prize essayist, 1889. "The Conspiracy of Pontiac," by CHARLES A. EASTMAN, M.D., of the Sioux nation. "A Century of Dishonor," by HERBERT WELSH. "Among the Zuñis," by J. WALTER FEWKES, PH.D. "The Indian at School," by GEN. S. C. ARMSTRONG. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) extract from address by William Henry Harrison on the Mound Builders of the Ohio Valley; (2) extract from Morton's "New English Canaan" on the Manners and Customs of the Indians; (3) John Eliot's "Brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians of New England," 1670; (4) extract from Hubbard's "Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians" (1677) on the Beginning of King Philip's War; (5) the Speech of Pontiac at the Council at the River Ecorces, from Parkman's "Conspiracy of Pontiac"; (6) extract from Black Hawk's autobiography, on the cause of the Black Hawk War; (7) Coronado's Letter to Mendoza (1540) on his Explorations in New Mexico; (8) Eleazar Wheelock's Narrative (1762) of the Rise and Progress of the Indian School at Lebanon, Conn.

The lectures for 1891, under the general title of "The New Birth of the World," were devoted to the important movements in the age preceding the discovery of America, the several lectures being as follows: "The Results of the Crusades," by F. E. E. HAMILTON, Old South prize essayist, 1883. "The Revival of Learning," by PROF. ALBERT B. HART. "The Builders of the Cathedrals," by PROF. MARSHALL S. SNOW. "The Changes which Gunpowder made," by FRANK A. HILL. "The Decline of the Barons," by WILLIAM EVERETT. "The Invention of Printing," by REV. EDWARD G. PORTER. "When Michel Angelo was a Boy," by HAMLIN GARLAND. "The Discovery of America," by REV. E. E. HALE. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) "The Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders," from the Chronicle of William of Malmesbury; (2) extract from More's "Utopia"; (3) "The Founding of Westminster Abbey," from Dean Stanley's "Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey"; (4) "The Siege of Constantinople," from Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"; (5) "Simon de Montfort," selections from Chronicles of the time; (6) "Caxton at Westminster," extract from Blade's Life of William Caxton; (7) "The Youth of Michel Angelo," from Vasari's "Lives of the Italian Painters"; (8) "The Discovery of America," from Ferdinand Columbus's life of his father.

The lectures for 1892 were upon "The Discovery of America," as follows: "What Men knew of the World before Columbus," by PROF. EDWARD S. MORSE. "Leif Erikson and the Northmen," by REV. EDWARD A. HORTON. "Marco Polo and his Book," by MR. O. W. DIMMICK. "The Story of Columbus," by MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE. "Americus Vespucius and the Early Books about America," by REV. E. G. PORTER. "Cortes and Pizarro," by PROF. CHAS. H. LEVERMORE. "De Soto and Ponce de Leon," by MISS RUTH BALLOU WHITTEMORE, Old South prize essayist, 1891. "Spain, France, and England in America," by MR. JOHN FISKE. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Strabo's Introduction to Geography; (2) The Voyages to Vinland, from the Saga of Eric the Red; (3) Marco Polo's account of Japan and Java; (4) Columbus's Letter to Gabriel Sanchez, describing his First Voyage; (5) Amerigo Vespucci's account of his First Voyage; (6) Cortes's account of the City of Mexico; (7) the Death of De Soto, from the "Narrative of a Gentleman of Elvas"; (8) Early Notices of the Voyages of the Cabots.

The lectures for 1893 were upon "The Opening of the Great West," as follows: "Spain and France in the Great West," by REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS. "The North-west Territory and the Ordinance of 1787," by JOHN M. MERRIAM. "Washington's Work in Opening the West," by EDWIN D. MEAD. "Marietta and the Western Reserve," by MISS LUCY W. WARREN, Old South prize essayist, 1892. "How the Great West was settled," by CHARLES C. COFFIN. "Lewis and Clarke and the Explorers of the Rocky Mountains," by REV. THOMAS VAN NESS. "California and Oregon," by PROF. JOSIAH ROYCE. "The Story of Chicago," by MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) De Vaca's account of his Journey to New Mexico, 1535; (2) Manasseh Cutler's Description of Ohio, 1787; (3) Washington's Journal of his Tour to the Ohio, 1770; (4) Garfield's Address on the North-west Territory and the Western Reserve; (5) George Rogers Clark's account of the Capture of Vincennes, 1779; (6) Jefferson's Life of Captain Meriwether Lewis; (7) Fremont's account of his Ascent of Fremont's Peak; (8) Father Marquette at Chicago, 1673.

The lectures for 1894 were upon "The Founders of New England," as follows: "William Brewster, the Elder of Plymouth," by REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE. "William Bradford, the Governor of Plymouth," by REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS. "John Winthrop, the Governor of Massachusetts," by HON. FREDERIC T. GREENHALGE. "John Harvard, and the Founding of Harvard College," by MR. WILLIAM R. THAYER. "John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians," by REV. JAMES DE NORMANDIE. "John Cotton, the Minister of Boston," by REV. JOHN COTTON BROOKS. "Roger Williams, the Founder of Rhode Island," by PRESIDENT E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS. "Thomas Hooker, the Founder of Connecticut," by REV. JOSEPH H. TWICHELL. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Bradford's Memoir of Elder Brewster; (2) Bradford's First Dialogue; (3) Winthrop's Conclusions for the Plantation in New England; (4) New England's First Fruits, 1643; (5) John Eliot's Indian Grammar Begun; (6) John Cotton's "God's Promise to his Plantation"; (7) Letters of Roger Williams to Winthrop; (8) Thomas Hooker's "Way of the Churches of New England."

The lectures for 1895 were upon "The Puritans in Old England," as follows: "John Hooper, the First Puritan," by EDWIN D. MEAD; "Cambridge, the Puritan University," by WILLIAM EVERETT; "Sir John Eliot

and the House of Commons," by PROF. ALBERT B. HART; "John Hampden and the Ship Money," by REV. F. W. GUNSAULUS; "John Pym and the Grand Remonstrance," by REV. JOHN CUCKSON; "Oliver Cromwell and the Commonwealth," by REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE; "John Milton, the Puritan Poet," by JOHN FISKE; "Henry Vane in Old England and New England," by PROF. JAMES K. HOSMER. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) The English Bible, selections from the various versions; (2) Hooper's Letters to Bullinger; (3) Sir John Eliot's "Apology for Socrates"; (4) Ship-money Papers; (5) Pym's Speech against Strafford; (6) Cromwell's Second Speech; (7) Milton's "Free Commonwealth"; (8) Sir Henry Vane's Defence.

The lectures for 1896 were upon "The American Historians," as follows: "Bradford and Winthrop and their Journals," by MR. EDWIN D. MEAD; "Cotton Mather and his 'Magnalia,'" by PROF. BARRETT WENDELL; "Governor Hutchinson and his History of Massachusetts," by PROF. CHARLES H. LEVERMORE; "Washington Irving and his Services for American History," by MR. RICHARD BURTON; "Bancroft and his History of the United States," by PRES. AUSTIN SCOTT; "Prescott and his Spanish Histories," by HON. ROGER WOLCOTT; "Motley and his History of the Dutch Republic," by REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS; "Parkman and his Works on France in America," by MR. JOHN FISKE. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Winthrop's "Little Speech" on Liberty; (2) Cotton Mather's "Bostonian Ebenezer," from the "Magnalia"; (3) Governor Hutchinson's account of the Boston Tea Party; (4) Adrian Van der Donck's Description of the New Netherlands in 1655; (5) The Debate in the Constitutional Convention on the Rules of Suffrage in Congress; (6) Columbus's Memorial to Ferdinand and Isabella, on his Second Voyage; (7) The Dutch Declaration of Independence in 1581; (8) Captain John Knox's account of the Battle of Quebec. The last five of these eight Leaflets illustrate the original material in which Irving, Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman worked in the preparation of their histories.

The lectures for 1897 were upon "The Anti-slavery Struggle," as follows: "William Lloyd Garrison, or Anti-slavery in the Newspaper," by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, JR.; "Wendell Phillips, or Anti-slavery on the Platform," by WENDELL PHILLIPS STAFFORD; "Theodore Parker, or Anti-slavery in the Pulpit," by REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE; "John G. Whittier, or Anti-slavery in the Poem," by MRS. ALICE FREEMAN PALMER; "Harriet Beecher Stowe, or Anti-slavery in the Story," by MISS MARIA L. BALDWIN; "Charles Sumner, or Anti-slavery in the Senate," by MOORFIELD STOREY; "John Brown, or Anti-slavery on the Scaffold," by FRANK B. SANBORN; "Abraham Lincoln, or Anti-slavery Triumphant," by HON. JOHN D. LONG. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) The First Number of *The Liberator*; (2) Wendell Phillips's Eulogy of Garrison; (3) Theodore Parker's Address on the Dangers from Slavery; (4) Whittier's account of the Anti-slavery Convention of 1833; (5) Mrs. Stowe's Story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin"; (6) Sumner's Speech on the Crime against Kansas; (7) Words of John Brown; (8) The First Lincoln and Douglas Debate.

The lectures for 1898 were upon "The Old World in the New," as follows: "What Spain has done for America," by REV. EDWARD G. PORTER; "What Italy has done for America," by REV. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS; "What France has done for America," by PROF. JEAN CHARLE-

MAGNE BRACQ; "What England has done for America," by MISS KATHARINE COMAN; "What Ireland has done for America," by PROF. F. SPENCER BALDWIN; "What Holland has done for America," by MR. EDWIN D. MEAD; "What Germany has done for America," by MISS ANNA B. THOMPSON; "What Scandinavia has done for America," by MR. JOSEPH P. WARREN. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Account of the Founding of St. Augustine, by Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales; (2) Amerigo Vespucci's Account of his Third Voyage; (3) Champlain's Account of the Founding of Quebec; (4) Barlowe's Account of the First Voyage to Roanoke; (5) Parker's Account of the Settlement of Londonderry, N.H.; (6) Juet's Account of the Discovery of the Hudson River; (7) Pastorius's Description of Pennsylvania, 1700: (8) Acrelius's Account of the Founding of New Sweden.

The lectures for 1899 were upon "The Life and Influence of Washington," as follows: "Washington in the Revolution," by MR. JOHN FISKE; "Washington and the Constitution," by REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE; "Washington as President of the United States," by REV. ALBERT E. WINSHIP; "Washington the True Expander of the Republic," by MR. EDWIN D. MEAD; "Washington's Interest in Education," by HON. ALFRED S. ROE; "The Men who worked with Washington," by MRS. ALICE FREEMAN PALMER; "Washington's Farewell Address," by REV. FRANKLIN HAMILTON; "What the World has thought and said of Washington," by PROF. EDWIN A. GROSVENOR. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Washington's Account of the Army at Cambridge in 1775; (2) Washington's Letters on the Constitution; (3) Washington's Inaugurals; (4) Washington's Letter to Benjamin Harrison in 1784; (5) Washington's Words on a National University; (6) Letters of Washington and Lafayette; (7) Washington's Farewell Address; (8) Henry Lee's Funeral Oration on Washington.

The lectures for 1900 were upon "The United States in the Nineteenth Century," as follows: "Thomas Jefferson, the First Nineteenth-century President," by EDWIN D. MEAD; "The Opening of the Great West," by REV. WILLIAM E. BARTON; "Webster and Calhoun, or the Nation and the States," by PROF. S. M. MACVANE; "Abraham Lincoln and the Struggle with Slavery," by REV. CHARLES G. AMES; "Steam and Electricity, from Fulton to Edison," by PROF. F. SPENCER BALDWIN; "The Progress of Education in the Nineteenth Century," by MR. FRANK A. HILL; "The American Poets," by MRS. MAY ALDEN WARD; "America and the World," by HON. JOHN L. BATES. The Leaflets were as follows: (1) Jefferson's Inaugurals; (2) Account of Louisiana in 1803; (3) Calhoun on the Government of the United States; (4) Lincoln's Cooper Institute Address; (5) Chancellor Livingston on the Invention of the Steamboat; (6) Horace Mann's Address on the Ground of the Free School System; (7) Rufus Choate's Address on the Romance of New England History; (8) Kossuth's First Speech in Faneuil Hall.

The Old South Leaflets, which have been published during the years since 1883 in connection with these annual courses of historical lectures at the Old South Meeting-house, have attracted so much attention and proved of so much service that the Directors have entered upon the publication of the Leaflets for general circulation, with the needs of schools, colleges, private clubs, and classes especially in mind. The Leaflets are prepared by Mr. Edwin D. Mead. They are largely reproductions of im-

portant original papers, accompanied by useful historical and bibliographical notes. They consist, on an average, of sixteen pages, and are sold at the low price of **five cents** a copy, or **four dollars per hundred**. The aim is to bring them within easy reach of everybody. The Old South Work, founded by Mrs. Mary Hemenway, and still sustained by provision of her will, is a work for the education of the people, and especially the education of our young people, in American history and politics; and its promoters believe that few things can contribute better to this end than the wide circulation of such leaflets as those now undertaken. It is hoped that professors in our colleges and teachers everywhere will welcome them for use in their classes, and that they may meet the needs of the societies of young men and women now happily being organized in so many places for historical and political studies. Some idea of the character of these Old South Leaflets may be gained from the following list of the subjects of the first hundred numbers, which are now ready. It will be noticed that most of the later numbers are the same as certain numbers in the annual series. Since 1890 they are essentially the same, and persons ordering the Leaflets need simply observe the following numbers.

No. **1**. The Constitution of the United States. **2**. The Articles of Confederation. **3**. The Declaration of Independence. **4**. Washington's Farewell Address. **5**. Magna Charta. **6**. Vane's "Healing Question." **7**. Charter of Massachusetts Bay, 1629. **8**. Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, 1638. **9**. Franklin's Plan of Union, 1754. **10**. Washington's Inaugurals. **11**. Lincoln's Inaugurals and Emancipation Proclamation. **12**. The Federalist, Nos. 1 and 2. **13**. The Ordinance of 1787. **14**. The Constitution of Ohio. **15**. Washington's Circular Letter to the Governors of the States, 1783. **16**. Washington's Letter to Benjamin Harrison, 1784. **17**. Verrazzano's Voyage, 1524. **18**. The Constitution of Switzerland. **19**. The Bill of Rights, 1689. **20**. Coronado's Letter to Mendoza, 1540. **21**. Eliot's Brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians, 1670. **22**. Wheelock's Narrative of the Rise of the Indian School at Lebanon, Conn., 1762. **23**. The Petition of Rights, 1628. **24**. The Grand Remonstrance. **25**. The Scottish National Covenants. **26**. The Agreement of the People. **27**. The Instrument of Government. **28**. Cromwell's First Speech to his Parliament. **29**. The Discovery of America, from the Life of Columbus by his son, Ferdinand Columbus. **30**. Strabo's Introduction to Geography. **31**. The Voyages to Vinland, from the Saga of Eric the Red. **32**. Marco Polo's Account of Japan and Java. **33**. Columbus's Letter to Gabriel Sanchez, describing the First Voyage and Discovery. **34**. Amerigo Vespucci's Account of his First Voyage. **35**. Cortes's Account of the City of Mexico. **36**. The Death of De Soto, from the "Narrative of a Gentleman of Elvas." **37**. Early Notices of the Voyages of the Cabots. **38**. Henry Lee's Funeral Oration on Washington. **39**. De Vaca's Account of his Journey to New Mexico, 1535. **40**. Manasseh Cutler's Description of Ohio, 1787. **41**. Washington's Journal of his Tour to the Ohio, 1770. **42**. Garfield's Address on the North-west Territory and the Western Reserve. **43**. George Rogers Clark's Account of the Capture of Vincennes, 1779. **44**. Jefferson's Life of Captain Meriwether Lewis. **45**. Fremont's Account of his Ascent of Fremont's Peak. **46**. Father Marquette at Chicago, 1673. **47**. Washington's Account of the Army at Cambridge, 1775. **48**. Bradford's Memoir of Elder Brewster. **49**. Bradford's First Dialogue. **50**. Winthrop's "Conclusions for the Plantation in New England." **51**. "New England's First

Fruits," 1643. **52.** John Eliot's "Indian Grammar Begun." **53.** John Cotton's "God's Promise to his Plantation." **54.** Letters of Roger Williams to Winthrop. **55.** Thomas Hooker's "Way of the Churches of New England." **56.** The Monroe Doctrine: President Monroe's Message of 1823. **57.** The English Bible, selections from the various versions. **58.** Hooper's Letters to Bullinger. **59.** Sir John Eliot's "Apology for Socrates." **60.** Ship-money Papers. **61.** Pym's Speech against Strafford. **62.** Cromwell's Second Speech. **63.** Milton's "A Free Commonwealth." **64.** Sir Henry Vane's Defence. **65.** Washington's Addresses to the Churches. **66.** Winthrop's "Little Speech" on Liberty. **67.** Cotton Mather's "Bostonian Ebenezer," from the "Magnalia." **68.** Governor Hutchinson's Account of the Boston Tea Party. **69.** Adrian Van der Donck's Description of New Netherlands in 1655. **70.** The Debate in the Constitutional Convention on the Rules of Suffrage in Congress. **71.** Columbus's Memorial to Ferdinand and Isabella, on his Second Voyage. **72.** The Dutch Declaration of Independence in 1581. **73.** Captain John Knox's Account of the Battle of Quebec. **74.** Hamilton's Report on the Coinage. **75.** William Penn's Plan for the Peace of Europe. **76.** Washington's Words on a National University. **77.** Cotton Mather's Lives of Bradford and Winthrop. **78.** The First Number of *The Liberator*. **79.** Wendell Phillips's Eulogy of Garrison. **80.** Theodore Parker's Address on the Dangers from Slavery. **81.** Whittier's Account of the Anti-slavery Convention of 1833. **82.** Mrs. Stowe's Story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." **83.** Sumner's Speech on the Crime against Kansas. **84.** The Words of John Brown. **85.** The First Lincoln and Douglas Debate. **86.** Washington's Account of his Capture of Boston. **87.** The Manners and Customs of the Indians, from Morton's "New English Canaan." **88.** The Beginning of King Philip's War, from Hubbard's History of Philip's War, 1677. **89.** Account of the Founding of St. Augustine, by Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales. **90.** Amerigo Vespucci's Account of his Third Voyage. **91.** Champlain's Account of the Founding of Quebec. **92.** Barlowe's Account of the First Voyage to Roanoke. **93.** Parker's Account of the Settlement of Londonderry, N.H. **94.** Juet's Account of the Discovery of the Hudson River. **95.** Pastorius's Description of Pennsylvania, 1700. **96.** Acrelius's Account of the Founding of New Sweden. **97.** Lafayette in the American Revolution. **98.** Letters of Washington and Lafayette. **99.** Washington's Letters on the Constitution. **100.** Robert Browne's "Reformation without Tarrying for Any." **101.** Grotius's "Rights of War and Peace." **102.** Columbus's Account of Cuba. **103.** John Adams's Inaugural. **104.** Jefferson's Inaugurals. **105.** Account of Louisiana in 1803. **106.** Calhoun on the Government of the United States. **107.** Lincoln's Cooper Institute Address. **108.** Chancellor Livingston on the Invention of the Steamboat. **109.** Horace Mann's Address on the Ground of the Free School System. **110.** Rufus Choate's Address on the Romance of New England History. **111.** Kossuth's First Speech in Faneuil Hall.

The leaflets, which are sold at five cents a copy or four dollars per hundred, are also furnished in bound volumes, each volnme containing twenty-five leaflets: Vol. i., Nos. 1–25; Vol. ii., 26–50; Vol. iii., 51–75; Vol. iv., 76–100. Price per volume, $1.50. Title-pages with table of contents will be furnished to all purchasers of the leaflets who wish to

bind them for themselves. Annual series of eight leaflets each, in paper covers, 50 cents a volume.

Address DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK, Old South Meeting-house, Boston.

It is hoped that this list of Old South Lectures and Leaflets will meet the needs of many clubs and classes engaged in the study of history, as well as the needs of individual students, serving as a table of topics. The subjests of the lectures in the various courses will be found to have a logical sequence; and the leaflets accompanying the several lectures can be used profitably in connection, containing as they do full historical notes and references to the best literature on the subjects of the lectures.

Old South Leaflets.

No. 104.

Jefferson's Inaugurals.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS AT WASHINGTON, MARCH 4, 1801.

Friends and Fellow-citizens:

Called upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow-citizens which is here assembled to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye,— when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the

vessel in which we are all embarked amidst the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will of course arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that, though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others, and should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strong-

est Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence pursue our own Federal and Republican principles, our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one-quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practised in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter,— with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens,— a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow-citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its Administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations: equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling

alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people,—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burthened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and, should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow-citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this the greatest of all, I have learnt to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence you reposed in our first and greatest revolutionary character, whose pre-eminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judg-

ment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional, and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a great consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, MARCH 4, 1805.

Proceeding, fellow-citizens, to that qualification which the Constitution requires before my entrance on the charge again conferred on me, it is my duty to express the deep sense I entertan of this new proof of confidence from my fellow-citizens at large, and the zeal with which it inspires me so to conduct myself as may best satisfy their just expectations.

On taking this station on a former occasion, I declared the principles on which I believed it my duty to administer the affairs of our Commonwealth. My conscience tells me I have on every occasion acted up to that declaration according to its obvious import and to the understanding of every candid mind.

In the transaction of your foreign affairs we have endeavored to cultivate the friendship of all nations, and especially of those with which we have the most important relations. We have done them justice on all occasions, favored where favor was lawful, and cherished mutual interests and intercourse on fair and equal terms. We are firmly convinced, and we act on that conviction, that with nations as with individuals our interests soundly calculated will ever be found inseparable from our moral duties, and history bears witness to the fact that a just nation is trusted on its word when recourse is had to armaments and wars to bridle others.

At home, fellow-citizens, you best know whether we have done well or ill. The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses, enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These, covering our land with officers and opening our doors to their intrusions, had already begun that process of domiciliary vexation which once entered is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of property and produce. If among these taxes some minor ones fell which had not been inconvenient, it was because their amount would not have paid the officers who collected them, and because, if they had any merit, the State authorities might adopt them instead of others less approved.

The remaining revenue on the consumption of foreign articles is paid chiefly by those who can afford to add foreign luxuries to domestic comforts, being collected on our seaboard and frontiers only; and, incorporated with the transactions of our mercantile citizens, it may be the pleasure and the pride of an American to ask, What farmer, what mechanic, what laborer, ever sees a tax-gatherer of the United States? These contributions enable us to support the current expenses of the Government, to fulfil contracts with foreign nations, to extinguish the native right of soil within our limits, to extend those limits, and to apply such a surplus to our public debts as places at a short day their final redemption; and, that redemption once effected, the revenue thereby liberated may, by a just repartition of it among the States and a corresponding amendment of the Constitution, be applied *in time of peace* to rivers, canals, roads, arts, manufactures, education, and other great objects within each State. *In time of war*, if injustice by ourselves or others must sometimes produce war, increased as the same revenue will be by increased population and consumption, and aided by other resources reserved for that crisis, it may meet within the year all the expenses of the year without encroaching on the rights of future generations by burthening them with the debts of the past. War will then be but a suspension of useful works, and a return to a state of peace a return to the progress of improvement.

I have said, fellow-citizens, that the income reserved had enabled us to extend our limits; but that extension may possibly pay for itself before we are called on, and in the mean time may keep down the accruing interest. In all events, it will replace the advances we shall have made. I know that the

acquisition of Louisiana has been disapproved by some from a candid apprehension that the enlargement of our territory would endanger its union. But who can limit the extent to which the federative principle may operate effectively? The larger our association, the less will it be shaken by local passions; and, in any view, is it not better that the opposite bank of the Mississippi should be settled by our own brethren and children than by strangers of another family? With which should we be most likely to live in harmony and friendly intercourse?

In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General Government. I have therefore undertaken on no occasion to prescribe the religious exercises suited to it, but have left them, as the Constitution found them, under the direction and discipline of the church or state authorities acknowledged by the several religious societies.

The aboriginal inhabitants of these countries I have regarded with the commiseration their history inspires. Endowed with the faculties and the rights of men, breathing an ardent love of liberty and independence, and occupying a country which left them no desire but to be undisturbed, the stream of overflowing population from other regions directed itself on these shores. Without power to divert or habits to contend against it, they have been overwhelmed by the current or driven before it. Now reduced within limits too narrow for the hunter's state, humanity enjoins us to teach them agriculture and the domestic arts; to encourage them to that industry which alone can enable them to maintain their place in existence, and to prepare them in time for that state of society which to bodily comforts adds the improvement of the mind and morals. We have therefore liberally furnished them with the implements of husbandry and household use. We have placed among them instructors in the arts of first necessity, and they are covered with the ægis of the law against aggressors from among ourselves.

But the endeavors to enlighten them on the fate which awaits their present course of life, to induce them to exercise their reason, follow its dictates, and change their pursuits with the change of circumstances have powerful obstacles to encounter. They are combated by the habits of their bodies, prejudices of their minds, ignorance, pride, and the influence of interested and crafty individuals among them who feel themselves something

in the present order of things and fear to become nothing in any other. These persons inculcate a sanctimonious reverence for the customs of their ancestors; that whatsoever they did must be done through all time; that reason is a false guide, and to advance under its counsel in their physical, moral, or political condition is perilous innovation: that their duty is to remain as their Creator made them, ignorance being safety and knowledge full of danger. In short, my friends, among them also is seen the action and counteraction of good sense and of bigotry. They, too, have their anti-philosophists who find an interest in keeping things in their present state, who dread reformation, and exert all their faculties to maintain the ascendency of habit over the duty of improving our reason and obeying its mandates.

In giving these outlines, I do not mean, fellow-citizens, to arrogate to myself the merit of the measures. That is due, in the first place, to the reflecting character of our citizens at large, who, by the weight of public opinion, influence and strengthen the public measures. It is due to the sound discretion with which they select from among themselves those to whom they confide the legislative duties. It is due to the zeal and wisdom of the characters thus selected, who lay the foundations of public happiness in wholesome laws, the execution of which alone remains for others: and it is due to the able and faithful auxiliaries, whose patriotism has associated them with me in the executive functions.

During this course of administration, and in order to disturb it, the artillery of the press has been levelled against us, charged with whatsoever its licentiousness could devise or dare. These abuses of an institution so important to freedom and science are deeply to be regretted, inasmuch as they tend to lessen its usefulness and to sap its safety. They might, indeed, have been corrected by the wholesome punishments reserved to and provided by the laws of the several States against falsehood and defamation: but public duties more urgent press on the time of public servants, and the offenders have therefore been left to find their punishment in the public indignation.

Nor was it uninteresting to the world that an experiment should be fairly and fully made whether freedom of discussion, unaided by power, is not sufficient for the propagation and protection of truth, whether a government conducting itself in the true spirit of its Constitution, with zeal and purity,

and doing no act which it would be unwilling the whole world should witness, can be written down by falsehood and defamation. The experiment has been tried; you have witnessed the scene. Our fellow-citizens looked on, cool and collected; they saw the latent source from which these outrages proceeded. They gathered around their public functionaries; and, when the Constitution called them to the decision by suffrage, they pronounced their verdict, honorable to those who had served them and consolatory to the friend of man who believes that he may be trusted with the control of his own affairs.

No inference is here intended that the laws provided by the States against false and defamatory publications should not be enforced. He who has time renders a service to public morals and public tranquillity in reforming these abuses by the salutary coercions of the law; but the experiment is noted to prove that, since truth and reason have maintained their ground against false opinions in league with false facts, the press, confined to truth, needs no other legal restraint. The public judgment will correct false reasonings and opinions on a full hearing of all parties; and no other definite line can be drawn between the inestimable liberty of the press and its demoralizing licentiousness. If there be still improprieties which this rule would not restrain, its supplement must be sought in the censorship of public opinion.

Contemplating the union of sentiment now manifested so generally as auguring harmony and happiness to our future course, I offer to our country sincere congratulations. With those, too, not yet rallied to the same point, the disposition to do so is gaining strength. Facts are piercing through the veil drawn over them, and our doubting brethren will at length see that the mass of their fellow-citizens, with whom they cannot yet resolve to act as to principles and measures, think as they think and desire what they desire; that our wish as well as theirs is that the public efforts may be directed honestly to the public good, that peace be cultivated, civil and religious liberty unassailed, law and order preserved, equality of rights maintained, and that state of property, equal or unequal, which results to every man from his own industry or that of his father. When satisfied of these views, it is not in human nature that they should not approve and support them. In the mean time let us cherish them with patient affection, let us do them justice, and more than justice, in all competitions of interest; and

we need not doubt that truth, reason, and their own interests will at length prevail, will gather them into the fold of their country, and will complete that entire union of opinion which gives to a nation the blessing of harmony and the benefit of all its strength.

I shall now enter on the duties to which my fellow-citizens have again called me, and shall proceed in the spirit of those principles which they have approved. I fear not that any motives of interest may lead me astray. I am sensible of no passion which could seduce me knowingly from the path of justice, but the weaknesses of human nature and the limits of my own understanding will produce errors of judgment sometimes injurious to your interests. I shall need, therefore, all the indulgence which I have heretofore experienced from my constituents: the want of it will certainly not lessen with increasing years. I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life, who has covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplications with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations.

JEFFERSON AND HIS INAUGURATION.

From Henry Adams's History of the United States.

According to the admitted standards of greatness, Jefferson was a great man. After all deductions on which his enemies might choose to insist, his character could not be denied elevation, versatility, breadth, insight, and delicacy; but neither as a politician nor as a political philosopher did he seem at ease in the atmosphere which surrounded him. As a leader of democracy, he appeared singularly out of place. As reserved as President Washington in the face of popular familiarities, he never showed himself in crowds. During the last thirty years of his life he was not seen in a Northern city, even during his Presidency; nor indeed was he seen at all except on horseback, or by his friends and visitors in his own house. With manners apparently popular and informal, he led a life of his own, and allowed few persons to share it. His tastes were for that day

excessively refined. His instincts were those of a liberal European nobleman, like the Duc de Liancourt; and he built for himself at Monticello a château above contact with man. The rawness of political life was an incessant torture to him, and personal attacks made him keenly unhappy. His true delight was in an intellectual life of science and art. To read, write, speculate in new lines of thought, to keep abreast of the intellect of Europe, and to feed upon Homer and Horace were pleasures more to his mind than any to be found in a public assembly. He had some knowledge of mathematics and a little acquaintance with classical art; but he fairly revelled in what he believed to be beautiful, and his writings often betrayed subtile feeling for artistic form,—a sure mark of intellectual sensuousness. He shrank from whatever was rough or coarse, and his yearning for sympathy was almost feminine. That such a man should have ventured upon the stormy ocean of politics was surprising, the more because he was no orator, and owed nothing to any magnetic influence of voice or person. Never effective in debate, for seventeen years before his Presidency he had not appeared in a legislative body except in the chair of the Senate. He felt a nervous horror for the contentiousness of such assemblies, and even among his own friends he sometimes abandoned for the moment his strongest convictions rather than support them by an effort of authority.

If Jefferson appeared ill at ease in the position of a popular leader, he seemed equally awkward in the intellectual restraints of his own political principles. His mind shared little in common with the provincialism on which the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were founded. His instincts led him to widen rather than to narrow the bounds of every intellectual exercise; and, if vested with political authority, he could no more resist the temptation to stretch his powers than he could abstain from using his mind on any subject merely because he might be drawn upon ground supposed to be dangerous. He was a deist, believing that men could manage their own salvation without the help of a state church. Prone to innovation, he sometimes generalized without careful analysis. He was a theorist, prepared to risk the fate of mankind on the chance of reasoning far from certain in its details. His temperament was sunny and sanguine, and the atrabilious philosophy of New England was intolerable to him. He was curiously vulnerable, for he seldom wrote a page without exposing himself to attack. He was superficial in his knowledge, and a martyr to the disease of omniscience. Ridicule of his opinions and of himself was an easy task, in which his Federalist opponents delighted, for his English was often confused, his assertions inaccurate, and at times of excitement he was apt to talk with indiscretion; while, with all his extraordinary versatility of character and opinions, he seemed during his entire life to

breathe with perfect satisfaction nowhere except in the liberal, literary, and scientific air of Paris in 1789.

Jefferson aspired beyond the ambition of a nationality, and embraced in his view the whole future of man. That the United States should become a nation like France, England, or Russia, should conquer the world like Rome, or develop a typical race like the Chinese, was no part of his scheme. He wished to begin a new era. Hoping for a time when the world's ruling interests should cease to be local and should become universal; when questions of boundary and nationality should become insignificant; when armies and navies should be reduced to the work of police, and politics should consist only in non-intervention,—he set himself to the task of governing, with this golden age in view. Few men have dared to legislate as though eternal peace were at hand, in a world torn by wars and convulsions and drowned in blood; but this was what Jefferson aspired to do. Even in such dangers, he believed that Americans might safely set an example which the Christian world should be led by interest to respect and at length to imitate. As he conceived a true American policy, war was a blunder, an unnecessary risk; and even in case of robbery and aggression the United States, he believed, had only to stand on the defensive in order to obtain justice in the end. He would not consent to build up a new nationality merely to create more navies and armies, to perpetuate the crimes and follies of Europe; the central government at Washington should not be permitted to indulge in the miserable ambitions that had made the Old World a hell, and frustrated the hopes of humanity. . . .

Jefferson was the first President inaugurated at Washington; and the ceremony, necessarily simple, was made still simpler for political reasons. The retiring President was not present at the installation of his successor. In Jefferson's eyes a revolution had taken place as vast as that of 1776; and if this was his belief, perhaps the late President was wise to retire from a stage where everything was arranged to point a censure upon his principles, and where he would have seemed, in his successor's opinion, as little in place as George III. would have appeared at the installation of President Washington. The collapse of government which marked the last weeks of February, 1801, had been such as to leave of the old Cabinet only Samuel Dexter of Massachusetts, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Benjamin Stoddert, of Maryland, the Secretary of the Navy, still in office. John Marshall, the late Secretary of State, had been appointed, six weeks before, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

In this first appearance of John Marshall as Chief Justice, to administer the oath of office, lay the dramatic climax of the inauguration. The retiring President, acting for what he supposed to be the best interests of the country, by one of his last acts of power, deliberately intended to perpetuate the principles of his administration,

placed at the head of the judiciary, for life, a man as obnoxious to Jefferson as the bitterest New England Calvinist could have been; for he belonged to that class of conservative Virginians whose devotion to President Washington, and whose education in the common law, caused them to hold Jefferson and his theories in antipathy. The new President and his two Secretaries were political philanthropists, bent on restricting the powers of the national government in the interests of human liberty. The Chief Justice, a man who in grasp of mind and steadiness of purpose had no superior, perhaps no equal, was bent on enlarging the powers of government in the interests of justice and nationality. As they stood face to face on this threshold of their power, each could foresee that the contest between them would end only with life. . . .

John Davis, one of many Englishmen who were allowed by Burr to attach themselves to him on the chance of some future benefit to be derived from them, asserted in a book of American travels published in London two years afterward that he was present at the inauguration, and that Jefferson rode on horseback to the Capitol, and, after hitching his horse to the palings, went in to take the oath. This story, being spread by the Federalist newspapers, was accepted by the Republicans, and became a legend of the Capitol. In fact, Davis was not then at Washington; and his story was untrue. Afterward, as President, Jefferson was in the habit of going on horseback, rather than in a carriage, wherever business called him; and the Federalists found fault with him for doing so. "He makes it a point," they declared,* "when he has occasion to visit the Capitol to meet the representatives of the nation on public business, to go on a single horse, which he leads into the shed and hitches to a peg." Davis wished to write a book that should amuse Englishmen; and, in order to give an air of truth to invention, he added that he was himself present at the ceremony. Jefferson was then living as Vice-President at Conrad's boarding-house, within a stone's throw of the Capitol. He did not mount his horse only to ride across the square and dismount in a crowd of observers. Doubtless he wished to offer an example of republican simplicity, and he was not unwilling to annoy his opponents; but the ceremony was conducted with proper form.

Edward Thornton, then in charge of the British Legation at Washington, wrote to Lord Grenville, then Foreign Secretary in Pitt's administration, a despatch enclosing the new President's Inaugural Address, with comments upon its democratic tendencies; and, after a few remarks on this subject, he added: † —

"The same republican spirit which runs through this performance, and which in many passages discovers some bitterness through

* *Evening Post*, April 20, 1802.

† Thornton to Grenville, March 4, 1801; MSS. British Archives.

all the sentiments of conciliation and philanthropy with which it is overcharged, Mr. Jefferson affected to display in performing the customary ceremonies. He came from his own lodgings to the House where the Congress convenes, and which goes by the name of the Capitol, on foot, in his ordinary dress, escorted by a body of militia artillery from the neighboring State, and accompanied by the Secretaries of the Navy and the Treasury, and a number of his political friends in the House of Representatives. He was received by Mr. Burr, the Vice-President of the United States, who arrived a day or two ago at the seat of government, and who was previously admitted this morning to the chair of the Senate: and was afterward complimented at his own lodgings by the very few foreign agents who reside at this place, by the members of Congress, and other public officials."

Only the north wing of the Capitol had then been so far completed as to be occupied by the Senate, the courts, and the small library of Congress. The centre rose not much above its foundations; and the south wing, some twenty feet in height, contained a temporary oval brick building, commonly called the "Oven," in which the House of Representatives sat in some peril of their lives: for, had not the walls been strongly shored up from without, the structure would have crumbled to pieces. Into the north wing the new President went, accompanied by the only remaining secretaries, Dexter and Stoddert, and by his friends from the House. Received by Vice-President Burr, and seated in the chair between Burr and Marshall, after a short pause Jefferson rose, and in a somewhat inaudible voice began his Inaugural Address.

Time, which has laid its chastening hand on many reputations, and has given to many once famous formulas a meaning unsuspected by their authors, has not altogether spared Jefferson's first Inaugural Address, although it was for a long time almost as well known as the Declaration of Independence; yet this Address was one of the few State Papers which should have lost little of its interest by age. As the starting-point of a powerful political party, the first Inaugural was a standard by which future movements were measured: and it went out of fashion only when its principles were universally accepted or thrown aside. Even as a literary work, it possessed a certain charm of style peculiar to Jefferson, a flavor of Virginia thought and manners, a Jeffersonian ideality calculated to please the ear of later generations forced to task their utmost powers in order to carry the complex trains of their thought.

The chief object of the Address was to quiet the passions which had been raised by the violent agitation of the past eight years. Every interest of the new Administration required that the extreme Federalists should be disarmed. Their temper was such as to endanger both Administration and Union; and their power was still

formidable, for they controlled New England and contested New York. To them Jefferson turned: "Let us unite with one heart and one mind," he entreated; "let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists." . . .

A revolution had taken place: but the new President seemed anxious to prove that there had been no revolution at all. A new experiment in government was to be tried, and the philosopher at its head began by pledging himself to follow in the footsteps of his predecessors. Americans ended by taking him at his word, and by assuming that there was no break of continuity between his ideas and those of President Washington.

LETTER FROM JEFFERSON TO SAMUEL ADAMS.

Washington, Mar. 29, 1801.

I addressed a letter to you, my very dear and antient friend, on the 4th of March: not indeed to you by name, but through the medium of some of my fellow citizens whom occasion called on me to address. In meditating the matter of that address, I often asked myself, is this exactly in the spirit of the patriarch of liberty, Samuel Adams? Is it as he would express it? Will he approve of it? I have felt a great deal for our country in the times we have seen. But individually for no one so much as yourself. When I have been told that you were avoided, insulted, frowned on, I could but ejaculate, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' I confess I felt an indignation for you, which for myself I have been able, under every trial, to keep entirely passive. However, the storm is over, and we are in port. The ship was not rigged for the service she was put on. We will show the smoothness of her motions on her republican tack. I hope we shall once more see harmony restored among our citizens, & an entire oblivion of past feuds. Some of the leaders who have most committed themselves cannot come into this. But I hope the great body of our fellow citizens will do it. I will sacrifice everything but principle to procure it. A few examples of justice on officers who have perverted their functions to the oppression of their fellow citizens must, in justice to those citizens, be made. But opinion, & the just maintenance of it, shall never be a crime in my view: nor bring injury on the individual. Those whose misconduct in office ought to have produced their re-

moval even by my predecessor, must not be protected by the delicacy due only to honest men. How much I lament that time has deprived me of your aid. It would have been a day of glory which should have called you to the first office of the administration. But give us your counsel, my friend, and give us your blessing; and be assured that there exists not in the heart of man a more faithful esteem than mine to you, & that I shall ever bear you the most affectionate veneration and respect.

The letter from Jefferson to Samuel Adams immediately preceding, written just after his inauguration, is of interest as an expression of the peculiar esteem and reverence which he felt for "the Father of the American Revolution." It is also of interest as an illustration of Jefferson's revelation of his feelings in his letters so much more truly than in his messages and addresses. The importance of this fact is well emphasized by Henry Adams, from whose just and acute characterization of Jefferson extracts are given above. Jefferson's writings are mostly letters,—there are few essays or systematic works,—and few letters of the period are more pregnant, varied, or informing. An edition of Jefferson's writings in nine volumes, edited by H. A. Washington, was published in 1853 by the authority of the government. The publication of a completer and more critical edition, edited by Paul Leicester Ford, was begun in 1892.

The completest biography of Jefferson is that by Randall, in three volumes, published in 1858. The important biography by Tucker appeared twenty years earlier; and the "Memoirs, Correspondence, and Miscellanies of Thomas Jefferson," by Thomas J. Randolph, earlier still. The best popular life is that by James Parton. The volume on Jefferson in the "American Statesmen" series is by John T. Morse, Jr. The life, by James Schouler, in the "Makers of America" series, is an admirable little book. A valuable supplement to all is "The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson," by his great-grand-daughter, Sarah N. Randolph.

For the period of Jefferson's Presidency we are peculiarly fortunate. To this are devoted the first four of the nine volumes of Henry Adams's History of the United States, the history of Jefferson's and Madison's administrations. There is no better work relating to any period of American history. In wealth of knowledge, in thoroughness and accuracy, in sympathetic appreciation of the time and its men, in grasp and warmth and literary charm, this stands in the front rank of American histories; and to it the student is referred for the most adequate introduction to the time of Jefferson's inauguration and administration.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

88

Old South Leaflets.

No. 105.

An Account of Louisiana.

1803.

Being an Abstract of Documents in the Offices of the Departments of State and of the Treasury.

The object of the following pages is to consolidate the information respecting the present state of Louisiana, furnished to the Executive by several individuals among the best informed upon that subject.

Of the province of Louisiana no general map, sufficiently correct to be depended upon, has been published, nor has any been yet procured from a private source. It is indeed probable that surveys have never been made on so extensive a scale as to afford the means of laying down the various regions of a country which, in some of its parts, appears to have been but imperfectly explored.

Boundaries.— The precise boundaries of Louisiana, westwardly of the Mississippi, though very extensive, are at present involved in some obscurity. Data are equally wanting to assign with precision its northern extent. From the source of the Mississippi, it is bounded eastwardly by the middle of the channel of that river to the thirty-first degree of latitude: thence it is asserted upon very strong grounds that according to its limits, when formerly possessed by France, it stretches to the east, as far, at least, as the river Perdigo, which runs into the bay of Mexico, eastward of the river Mobille.

It may be consistent with the view of these notes to remark that Louisiana, including the Mobille settlements, was discovered and peopled by the French, whose monarchs made several

grants of its trade, in particular to Mr. Crosat in 1712, and some years afterwards, with his acquiescence, to the well-known company projected by Mr. Law. This company was relinquished in the year 1731. By a secret convention on the 3d November, 1762, the French government ceded so much of the province as lies beyond the Mississippi, as well as the island of New-Orleans, to Spain, and by the treaty of peace which followed in 1763 the whole territory of France and Spain eastward of the middle of the Mississippi to the Iberville, thence through the middle of that river, and the lakes Maurepas and Ponchartrain to the sea, was ceded to Great Britain. Spain having conquered the Floridas from Great Britain during our Revolutionary War, they were confirmed to her by the treaty of peace of 1783. By the treaty of St. Ildefonso, of the 1st of October, 1800, his Catholic Majesty promises and engages on his part to cede back to the French Republic, six months after the full and entire execution of the conditions and stipulations therein contained, relative to the Duke of Parma, "the colony or province of Louisiana, with the same extent that it actually has in the hands of Spain, that it had when France possessed it, and such as it ought to be after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states." This treaty was confirmed and enforced by that of Madrid of the 21st March, 1801. From France it passed to us by the treaty of the 30th of April last, with a reference to the above clause, as descriptive of the limits ceded.

Divisions of the Province.— The province as held by Spain, including a part of West Florida, is laid off into the following principal divisions: Mobille, from Balise to the city, New-Orleans and the country on both sides of Lake Ponchartrain, first and second German coasts, Catahanose, Fourche, Venezuela, Iberville, Galvez-Town, Baton-Rouge, Pointe Coupee, Atacapas, Opelousas, Ouachita, Avoyelles, Rapide, Natchitoches, Arkansas, and the Illinois.

In the Illinois there are commandants, at New-Madrid, St. Genevieve, New Bourbon, St. Charles and St. Andrews, all subordinate to the commandant general.

Baton-Rouge having been made a government, subsequently to the treaty of limits, etc., with Spain, the posts of Manchac and Thompson's Creek, or Feliciana, were added to it.

Chapitoulas has sometimes been regarded as a separate command, but is now included within the jurisdiction of the

city. The lower part of the river has likewise had occasionally a separate commandant.

Many of the present establishments are separated from each other by immense and trackless deserts, having no communication with each other by land, except now and then a solitary instance of its being attempted by hunters, who have to swim rivers, expose themselves to the inclemency of the weather, and carry their provisions on their backs for a time, proportioned to the length of their journey. This is particularly the case on the west of the Mississippi, where the communication is kept up only by water, between the capital and the distant settlements, three months being required to convey intelligence from the one to the other by the Mississippi. The usual distance accomplished by a boat in ascending is five leagues per day.

The rapidity of the current in the spring season especially, when the waters of all the rivers are high, facilitates the descent, so that the same voyage by water, which requires three or four months to perform from the capital, may be made to it in from twelve to sixteen days. The principal settlements in Louisiana are on the Mississippi, which begins to be cultivated about twenty leagues from the sea, where the plantations are yet thin, and owned by the poorest people. Ascending, you see them improve on each side, till you reach the city, which is situated on the east bank, on a bend of the river, 35 leagues from the sea,

Chapitoulas, First and Second German Coasts.— Catahanose. — Fourche and Iberville.— The best and most approved are above the city, and comprehend what is there known by the Paroisse de Chapitoulas, Premier and Second Cote des Allemands, and extends 16 leagues.

Above this begins the parish of Catahanose, or first Acadian settlement, extending eight leagues on the river. Adjoining it and still ascending is the second Acadian settlement or parish of the Fourche, which extends about six leagues. The parish of Iberville then commences, and is bounded on the east side by the river of the same name, which, though dry a great part of the year, yet, when the Mississippi is raised, it communicates with the lakes Maurepas and Ponchartrain, and through them with the sea, and thus forms what is called the island of New-Orleans. Except on the point just below the Iberville the country from New-Orleans is settled the whole way along

the river, and presents a scene of uninterrupted plantations in sight of each other, whose fronts to the Mississippi are all cleared and occupy on that river from 5 to 25 acres with a depth of 40, so that a plantation of 5 acres in front contains 200. A few sugar plantations are formed in the parish of Catahanose; but the remainder is devoted to cotton and provisions, and the whole is an excellent soil, incapable of being exhausted. The plantations are but one deep on the island of New-Orleans, and on the opposite side of the river as far as the mouth of the Iberville, which is 35 leagues above New-Orleans.

Bayou de Fourche.— Atacapas and Opelousas.— About 25 leagues from the last-mentioned place on the west side of the Mississippi, the creek or Bayou of the Fourche, called in old maps La Riviere des Chitamaches, flows from the Mississippi, and communicates with the sea to the west of the Balise. The entrance of the Mississippi is navigable only at high water, but will then admit of craft of from 60 to 70 tons' burthen. On both banks of this creek are settlements, one plantation deep, for near 15 leagues; and they are divided into two parishes. The settlers are numerous, though poor; and the culture is universally cotton. On all creeks making from the Mississippi the soil is the same as on the bank of the river; and the border is the highest part of it, from whence it descends gradually to the swamp. In no place on the low lands is there depth more than suffices for one plantation, before you come to the low grounds, incapable of cultivation. This creek affords one of the communications to the two populous and rich settlements of Atacapas and Opelousas, formed on and near the small rivers Teche and Vermillon which flow into the Bay of Mexico. But the principal and swiftest communication is by the Bayou or creek of Plaquemines, whose entrance into the Mississippi is 7 leagues higher up on the same side, and 32 above New-Orleans. These settlements abound in cattle and horses, have a large quantity of good land in their vicinity, and may be made of great importance. A part of their produce is sent by sea to New-Orleans, but the greater part is carried in batteaux by the creeks above mentioned.

Baton-Rouge and its Dependencies.— Immediately above the Iberville and on both sides of the Mississippi lies the parish of Manchac, which extends four leagues on the river, and is well cultivated. Above it commences the settlement of Baton-

Rouge, extending about 9 leagues. It is remarkable as being the first place where the high land is contiguous to the river, and here it forms a bluff from 30 to 40 feet above the greatest rise of the river. Here the settlements extend a considerable way back on the east side, and this parish has that of Thompson's Creek and Bayou Sara subordinate to it. The mouth of the first of these creeks is about 49 leagues from New-Orleans, and that of the latter 2 or 3 leagues higher up. They run from north-east to south-west, and their head-waters are north of the 31st degree of latitude, Their banks have the best soil and the greatest number of good cotton plantations of any part of Louisiana, and are allowed to be the garden of it.

Pointe Coupee & Fausse Riviere.— Above Baton-Rouge, at the distance of 50 leagues from New-Orleans, and on the west side of the Mississippi, is Pointe Coupee, a populous and rich settlement, extending 8 leagues along the river. Its produce is cotton. Behind it, on an old bed of the river, now a lake, whose outlets are closed up, is the settlement of Fausse Riviere, which is well cultivated.

In the space now described from the sea as high as and including the last-mentioned settlement is contained three-fourths of the population and seven-eighths of the riches of Louisiana.

From the settlement of Pointe Coupee on the Mississippi to Cape Girardeau above the mouth of the Ohio there is no land on the west side that is not overflowed in the spring to the distance of 8 or 10 leagues from the river, with from 2 to 12 feet of water, except a small spot near New-Madrid, so that in the whole extent there is no possibility of forming a considerable settlement contiguous to the river on that side. The eastern bank has in this respect a decided advantage over the western, as there are on it many situations which effectually command the river.

Red River and its Settlements.— On the west side of the Mississippi, 70 leagues from New-Orleans, is the mouth of the Red River, on whose banks and vicinity are the settlements of Rapide, Avoyelles, and Natchitoches, all of them thriving and populous. The latter is situate 75 leagues up the Red River. On the north side of the Red River, a few leagues from its junction with the Mississippi, is the Black River, on one of whose branches, a considerable way up, is the infant settlement of Ouachita, which from the richness of the soil may be made a place of importance. Cotton is the chief produce of these settle-

ments, but they have likewise a considerable Indian trade. The river Rouge, or Red River, is used to communicate with the frontiers of New Mexico.

Concord.— Arkansas.— St. Charles and St. Andrew, &c.— There is no other settlement on the Mississippi except the small one called Concord, opposite to the Natchez, till you come to the Arkansas River, whose mouth is 250 leagues above New-Orleans.

Here there are but a few families, who are more attached to the Indian trade (by which chiefly they live) than to cultivation. There is no settlement from this place to New-Madrid, which is itself inconsiderable. Ascending the river, you come to Cape Girardeau, St. Genevieve, and St. Louis, where, though the inhabitants are numerous, they raise little for exportation, and content themselves with trading with the Indians and working a few lead mines. This country is very fertile, especially on the banks of the Missouri, where there have been formed two settlements, called St. Charles and St. Andrew, mostly by emigrants from Kentucky. The peltry procured in the Illinois is the best sent to the Atlantic market, and the quantity is very considerable. Lead is to be had with ease, and in such quantities as to supply all Europe, if the population were sufficient to work the numerous mines to be found within two or three feet from the surface in various parts of the country. The settlements about the Illinois were first made by the Canadians, and their inhabitants still resemble them in their aversion to labor and love of a wandering life. They contain but few negroes, compared to the number of the whites; and it may be taken for a general rule that, in proportion to the distance of the capital, the number of blacks diminish below that of the whites, the former abounding most on the rich plantations in its vicinity.

General Description of Upper Louisiana.— When compared with the Indiana territory, the face of the country in Upper Louisiana is rather more broken, though the soil is equally fertile. It is a fact not to be contested that the west side of the river possesses some advantages not generally incident to those regions. It is elevated and healthy and well watered with a variety of large, rapid streams, calculated for mills and other water works. From Cape Girardeau, above the mouth of the Ohio, to the Missouri, the land on the east side of the Mississippi is low and flat and occasionally exposed to inundations;

that on the Louisiana side, contiguous to the river, is generally much higher, and in many places very rocky on the shore. Some of the heights exhibit a scene truly picturesque. They rise to a height of at least 300 feet, faced with perpendicular *lime and freestone*, carved into various shapes and figures by the hand of nature, and afford the appearance of a multitude of antique towers. From the tops of these elevations the land gradually slopes back from the river, without gravel or rock, and is covered with valuable timber. It may be said with truth that, for fertility of soil, no part of the world exceeds the borders of the Mississippi, the land yields an abundance of all the necessaries of life, and almost spontaneously, very little labor being required in the cultivation of the earth. That part of Upper Louisiana which borders on North Mexico is one immense *prairie*; it produces nothing but grass; it is filled with buffalo, deer, and other kinds of game; the land is represented as too rich for the growth of forest trees.

It is pretended that Upper Louisiana contains in its bowels many silver and copper mines, and various specimens of both are exhibited. Several trials have been made to ascertain the fact; but the want of skill in the artists has hitherto left the subject undecided.

The salt works are also pretty numerous: some belong to individuals, others to the public. They already yield an abundant supply for the consumption of the country, and, if properly managed, might become an article of more general exportation. The usual price per bushel is 150 cents in *cash* at the works. This price will be still lower as soon as the manufacture of the salt is assumed by government, or patronised by men who have large capitals to employ in the business. One extraordinary fact relative to salt must not be omitted. There exists about 1,000 miles up the Missouri, and not far from that river, *a Salt Mountain!* The existence of such a mountain might well be questioned, were it not for the testimony of several respectable and enterprising traders, who have visited it, and who have exhibited several bushels of the salt to the curiosity of the people of St. Louis, where some of it still remains. A specimen of the same salt has been sent to Marietta. This mountain is said to be 180 miles long and 45 in width, composed of solid rock salt, without any trees or even shrubs on it. Salt springs are very numerous beneath the surface of the mountain, and they flow through the fissures and

cavities of it. Caves of salt-petre are found in Upper Louisiana, though at some distance from the settlements. Four men on a trading voyage lately discovered one several hundred miles up the Missouri. They spent 5 or 6 weeks in the manufacture of this article, and returned to St. Louis with 400 weight of it. It proved to be good, and they sold it for a high price.

The geography of the Mississippi and Missouri, and their contiguity for a great length of way, are but little known. The traders assert that 100 miles above their junction a man may walk from one to the other in a day; and it is also asserted that 700 miles still higher up the portage may be crossed in four or five days. This portage is frequented by traders, who carry on a considerable trade with some of the Missouri Indians. Their general route is through Green Bay, which is an arm of Lake Michigan; they then pass into a small lake connected with it, and which communicates with the Fox River; they then cross over a short portage into the Ouisconsing River, which unites with the Mississippi some distance below the falls of St. Anthony. It is also said that the traders communicate with the Mississippi above these falls, through Lake Superior; but their trade in that quarter is much less considerable.

Canal of Carondelet.— Behind New-Orleans is a canal about 1½ miles long, which communicates with a creek called the Bayou St. Jean, flowing into Lake Ponchartrain. At the mouth of it, about 2½ leagues from the city, is a small fort called St. Jean, which commands the entrance from the lake. By this creek the communication is kept up through the lake and the Rigolets to Mobille and the settlements in West Florida. Craft drawing from 6 to 8 feet water can navigate to the mouth of the creek, but except in particular swells of the lake cannot pass the bar without being lightened.

St. Bernardo.— On the east side of the Mississippi, about five leagues below New-Orleans and at the head of the English bend, is a settlement known by the name of the Poblacion de St. Bernardo, or the Terre aux Bœufs, extending on both sides of a creek or drain, whose head is contiguous to the Mississippi, and which flowing eastward, after a course of 18 leagues and dividing itself into two branches, falls into the sea and lake Borgne. This settlement consists of two parishes, almost all the inhabitants of which are Spaniards from the Canaries, who

content themselves with raising fowls, corn, and garden stuff for the Market at New-Orleans. The lands cannot be cultivated to any great distance from the banks of the creek on account of the vicinity of the marsh behind them, but the place is susceptible of great improvement and of affording another communication to small craft of from 8 to 10 feet draught between the sea and the Mississippi.

Settlements below the English Turn.— At the distance of 16 leagues below New-Orleans the settlements on both banks of the river are of but small account. Between these and the fort of Plaquemines the country is overflowed in the spring, and in many places is incapable of cultivation at any time, being a morass almost impassable by man or beast. This small tongue of land extends considerably into the sea, which is visible on both sides of the Mississippi from a ship's mast.

Country from Plaquemines to the Sea, and Effect of the Hurricanes.— From Plaquemines to the sea is 12 or 13 leagues. The country is low, swampy, chiefly covered with reeds, having little or no timber and no settlement whatever. It may be necessary to mention here that the whole lower part of the country from the English Turn downward is subject to overflowing in hurricanes, either by the recoiling of the river or reflux from the sea on each side; and on more than one occasion it has been covered from the depth of 2 to 10 feet, according to the descent of the river, whereby many lives were lost, horses and cattle swept away, and a scene of destruction laid. The last calamity of this kind happened in 1794; but, fortunately, they are not frequent. In the preceding year the engineer who superintended the erection of the fort of Plaquemines was drowned in his house near the fort, and the workmen and garrison escaped only by taking refuge on an elevated spot in the fort, on which there were, notwithstanding, 2 or 3 feet of water. These hurricanes have generally been felt in the month of August. Their greatest fury lasts about 12 hours. They commence in the south-east, veer about to all points of the compass, are felt most severely below and seldom extend more than a few leagues above New-Orleans. In their whole course they are marked with ruin and desolation. Until that of 1793 there had been none felt from the year 1780.

Passes, or Mouths of the Mississippi.—About 8 leagues below Plaquemines, the Mississippi divides itself into three channels, which are called the passes of the river; viz., the East, South,

and South-west passes. Their course is from 5 to 6 leagues to the sea. The space between is a marsh with little or no timber on it; but from its situation it may hereafter be rendered of importance. The East pass, which is on the left hand going down the river, is divided into two branches about two leagues below, viz. the Pass à la Loutre, and that known to mariners by the name of the Balize, at which there is a small block house and some huts of the pilots, who reside only here. The first of these secondary channels contains at present but 8 feet water, the latter from 14 to 16 according to the seasons. The South pass, which is directly in front of the Mississippi, has always been considered as entirely choaked up, but has 10 feet water. The South-west pass, which is on the right, is the longest and narrowest of all the passes, and a few years ago had 18 feet water, and was that by which the large ships always entered and sailed from the Mississippi. It has now but 8 feet water, and will probably remain so for some time. In speaking of the quantity of water in the passes, it must be understood of what is on the bar of each pass; for immediately after passing the bar, which is very narrow, there are from 5 to 7 fathoms at all seasons.

Country East of Lake Ponchartrain.—The country on the east side of Lake Ponchartrain to Mobille, and including the whole extent between the American line, the Mississippi above New-Orleans, and the lakes (with the exception of a tract of about 30 miles on the Mississippi, and as much square contiguous to the line, and comprehending the waters of Thompson's Creek, Bayou Sara, and the Amet) is a poor thin soil, overgrown with pine, and contains no good land whatever, unless on the banks of a few small rivers. It would, however, afford abundant supplies of pitch, tar and pine lumber, and would feed large herds of cattle.

The Inhabitants and their Origin.— The inhabitants of Louisiana are chiefly the descendants of the French and Canadians. There are a considerable number of English and Americans in New-Orleans. The two German coasts are peopled by the descendants of settlers from Germany, and a few French mixed with them. The three succeeding settlements up to Baton-Rouge contain mostly Acadians, banished from Nova Scotia by the English and their descendants. The government of Baton-Rouge, especially the east side, which includes all the country between the Iberville and the Amer-

ican line, is composed partly of Acadians, a very few French, and of a great majority of Americans. On the west side they are mostly Acadians: at Pointe Coupee and Faussee River they are French and Acadians. Of the population of the Atacapas and Opelousas, a considerable part is American. Natchitoches, on the Red River, contains but a few Americans, and the remainder of the inhabitants are French; but the former are more numerous in the other settlements on that river,—viz., Avoyelles, Rapide, and Ouacheta. At Arkansas they are, mostly French; and at New-Madrid, Americans. At least two-fifths, if not a greater proportion of all the settlers on the Spanish side of the Mississippi, in the Illinois country, are likewise supposed to be Americans. Below New-Orleans the population is altogether French, and the descendants of Frenchmen.

New Orleans.— By recurring to the maps and examining the position of Louisiana, it will appear that the lower part projects considerably into the sea. It has in all probability been formed by the sediment brought down by the current and deposited on the flat coast. There is therefore on the east side but a very narrow slip along the bank of the river, from the sea to the Iberville. The land is not generally susceptible of cultivation more than a mile in depth from the river: the rest is low and swampy to the lakes and the sea, but in general abounds with cypress timber, which is sawed by mills, which are worked by artificial streams from the Mississippi in the time of freshes. They generally run five months in the year.

What has been said of the east equally applies to the west side of the river. The soil and situation are nearly the same. After leaving the bank of the river, there is an immense swamp, intersected by creeks and lakes, extending to the high lands of Atacapas, and occupying a space of thirty or forty leagues.

The city of New-Orleans, which is regularly laid out, on the east side of the Mississippi, in lat. 30, N., and long. 90, W., extends nearly a mile along the river, from the gate of France on the south to that of Chapitoulas above, and a little more than a third of a mile in breadth, from the river to the rampart; but it has an extensive suburb on the upper side. The houses in front of the town, and for a square or two backwards, are mostly of brick, covered with slate or tile, and many of two stories. The remainder are of wood, covered with

shingles. The streets cross each other at right angles, and are 32 French feet wide. The squares between the intersections of the streets have a front of 300 French feet. There is in the middle of the front of the city a *place d'armes*, facing which the church and town house are built. There are from 12 to 1,400 houses in the city and suburbs. The population may be estimated at 10,000, including the seamen and garrison. It was fortified in 1793, but the works were originally defective, could not have been defended, and are now in ruins. The powder magazine is on the opposite bank of the river.

The public buildings and other public property in New-Orleans are as follows: —

Two very extensive brick stores, from 160 to 180 feet in length and about 30 in breadth. They are one-story high, and covered with shingles.

A government house, stables, and garden, occupying a front of about 220 feet on the river, in the middle of the town, and extending 336 feet back to the next street.

A military hospital.

An ill-built custom-house of wood, almost in ruins, in the upper part of the city, near the river.

An extensive barrack in the lower part of the city, fronting on the river, and calculated to lodge 12 or 1,400 men.

A large lot adjoining the king's stores, with a few sheds in it. It serves as a park for artillery.

A prison, town house, market house, assembly room, some ground rents, and the common about the town.

A public school for the rudiments of the Spanish language.

A cathedral church unfinished, and some houses belonging to it.

A charitable hospital, with some houses belonging to it, and a revenue of 1,500 dollars annually, endowed by an individual lately deceased.

The canal de Carondelet has been already described.

Number of Inhabitants.— According to the annexed census,* No. 2, of Louisiana, including Pensacola and the Natchez, as made in 1785, the whole number of inhabitants amounted to 32,062, of which 14,215 were free whites, 1,303 free people of colour, and 16,544 slaves.

The statement, No. 3, from the latest documents, makes the whole number 42,375, the free whites, 21,244, the free people of colour, 1,768, and the slaves, 12,920.

* Referring to appendix not here printed.

A particular statement respecting the population, &c., of Upper Louisiana, and another containing the census of New Orleans, in this year, are numbered 4 and 5 in the appendix.

These papers certainly exhibit a smaller number than the real population of the country. From an official document, made in July last, and received from Atacapas since the statement, No. 3, was formed, it appears that it contained 2,270 whites, 210 free people of colour, 1,266 slaves, in all 3,746 souls instead of 1,447, as therein stated. It is highly probable that the return for the neighbouring district of Opelousas is in the same proportion underrated.

A conjectural estimation made by a gentleman of great respectability and correct information, residing at Natchez, raises the number of whites in the island of New Orleans, on the west side of the river, and some settlements on the east side, to 50, 150, and the number of blacks to 39,820. His statement is also subjoined, No. 6.

It is at all times difficult to obtain the full census of a county, and the impediments are increased in this from its scattered population. The actual enumeration may therefore fall short of the true numbers.

Militia.—There is a militia in Louisiana. The following is the return of it, made to the court of Spain, by the Baron of Carondelet.

	Militia.
From Balize to the city — volunteers of the Mississippi,	
— 4 companies of 100 men each — complete,	400
City — Battalion of the city, 5 companies,	500
Artillery company, with supernumeraries,	120
Carabineers, or privileged companies of horse,	
2 companies of 70 each — incomplete,	100
Mulattoes, 2 companies; negroes, 1 do.	300

Mixed legion of the Mississippi, comprehending Galveztown, Baton-Rouge, Pointe Coupee, Atacapas, and Opelousas, viz.

2 companies of grenadiers,
8 do. of fusileers,
4 do. of dragoons,
2 do. lately added from Bayou Sara.

16 companies of 100 men each, 1,600

Avoyelles, 1 company of infantry,	100
Oucheta, 1 do. of cavalry,	100
Natchitoches, 1 do. of infantry and 1 of cavalry,	200
Arkansas, 1 do. of infantry and cavalry,	100
Illinois, 4 do. of cavalry, 4 do. of infantry } These are always above the compliment.	800
Provincial regiment of Germans and Acadians, from the first German coast to Iberville,	
10 companies, viz. 2 of grenadiers, 8 fusileers,	1,000
Mobille and the country east of Lake Ponchartrain,	
2 companies of horse and foot incomplete,	120
	5,440

The same gentleman alluded to, page [13], makes the number of the militia to amount to 10,340 men within the same limits to which his estimate of the population applies. He distributes them in the several settlements, as follows:

1. The island of New-Orleans, with the opposite margin and the adjacent settlements,	5,000
2. The west margin from Manchac, including Pointe Coupee, and extending to the Red River,	800
3. Atacapas, along the coast, between the Delta of the Mississippi and the river Sabine,	350
4. Opelousas,	750
5. Red River, including Bayou Bœuf, Avoyelles, Rapide, and Natchitoches,	1,000
6. Ouachita,	300
7. Concord,	40
8. Arkansas,	150
9. New Madrid and its vicinity,	350
10. Illinois and Missouri,	1,000
11. The settlements on the east side of the Mississippi, from the American line to the Iberville, and some other settlements,	600
	10,340

It is to be observed that none of these statements include the country beyond the river Sabine, nor even all those which lie eastwardly of it. Data are also wanting to give them.

Fortifications.— St. Louis has a lieutenant colonel to com-

mand in it, and but few troops. Baton-Rouge is an ill-constructed fort, and has about 50 men. In describing the canal of Carondelet, the small fort of St. Jean has been mentioned, as has the block house at the Balize in its proper place. The fortifications of New-Orleans, noticed before, consist of five ill-constructed redoubts, with a covered way, palisade and ditch. The whole is going fast to decay, and it is supposed they would be of but little service in case of an attack. Though the powder magazine is on the opposite side of the river, there is no sufficient provision made for its removal to the city, in case of need.

The fort of Plaquemines, which is about twelve or thirteen leagues from the sea, is an ill-constructed, irregular brick work, on the eastern side of the Mississippi, with a ditch in front of the river, and protected on the lower side by a deep creek, flowing from the river to the sea. It is, however, imperfectly closed behind, and almost without defence there, too much reliance having been placed on the swampiness of the ground, which hardens daily. It might be taken, perhaps, by escalade, without difficulty. It is in a degree ruinous. The principal front is meant to defend the approach from the sea, and can oppose, at most, but eight heavy guns. It is built at a turn in the river, where ships in general must anchor, as the wind which brings them up so far is contrary in the next reach, which they mostly work through; and they would, therefore, be exposed to the fire of the fort. On the opposite bank are the ruins of a small closed redoubt, called Fort Bourbon, usually guarded by a sergeant's command. Its fire was intended to flank that of the fort of Plaquemines, and prevent shipping and craft from ascending or descending on that side. When a vessel appears, a signal is made on one side, and answered on the other. Should she attempt to pass without sending a boat on shore, she would be immediately fired upon.

Indians.— The Indian nations within the limits of Louisiana are as far known as follows, and consist of the numbers hereafter specified.

On the eastern bank of the Mississippi, about 25 leagues above Orleans, the remains of the nation of Houmas, or Red Men, which do not exceed 60 persons. There are no other Indians settled on this side of the river, either in Louisiana or West Florida, though they are at times frequented by parties of wandering Choctaws.

On the west side of the Mississippi are the remains of the Tounicas, settled near, and above Pointe Coupee on the river, consisting of fifty or sixty persons.

In the Atacapas.— On the lower parts of the Bayou Teche, at about eleven or twelve leagues from the sea, are two villages of Chitimachas, consisting of about an hundred souls.

The Atacapas, properly so called, dispersed thoughout the district, and chiefly on the Bayou or creek of Vermillion, about one hundred souls.

Wanderers of the tribes of Bilexis and Choctaws on Bayou Crocodile, which empties into the Teche, about fifty souls.

In the Opelousas, to the N. W. of Atacapas.— Two villages of Alibamas in the centre of the district near the church, consisting of one hundred persons.

Conchates dispersed through the country as far west as the river Sabinas and its neighbourhood, about three hundred and fifty persons.

On the River Rouge.— At Avoyelles, nineteen leagues from the Mississippi, is a village of the Biloni nation, and another on the lake of the Avoyelles, the whole about sixty souls.

At the Rapide, twenty-six leagues from the Mississippi, is a village of Choctaws of one hundred souls, and another of Biloxes, about two leagues from it, of about one hundred more: about eight or nine leagues higher up the Red River is a village of about fifty souls. All these are occasionally employed by the settlers in their neighbourhood as boatmen.

About eighty leagues above Natchitoches on the Red River is the nation of the Cadoquies, called by abbreviation Cados. They can raise from three to four hundred warriors, are the friends of the whites, and are esteemed the bravest and most generous of all the nations in this vast country. They are rapidly decreasing, owing to intemperance and the numbers annually destroyed by the Osages and Choctaws.

There are, besides the foregoing, at least four to five hundred families of Choctaws, who are dispersed on the west side of the Mississippi, on the Ouacheta and Red Rivers, as far west as Natchitoches; and the whole nation would have emigrated across the Mississippi, had it not been for the opposition of the Spaniards and the Indians on that side who had suffered by their aggressions.

On the River Arkansas, etc.— Between the Red River and the Arkansas there are but a few Indians, the remains of tribes

almost extinct. On this last river is the nation of the same name, consisting of about two hundred and sixty warriors. They are brave, yet peaceable and well-disposed, and have always been attached to the French, and espoused their cause in their wars with the Chickasaws, whom they have always resisted with success. They live in three villages; the first is at eighteen leagues from the Mississippi on the Arkansas River, and the others are at three and six leagues from the first. A scarcity of game on the eastern side of the Mississippi has lately induced a number of Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, &c., to frequent the neighbourhood of Arkansas, where game is still in abundance: they have contracted marriages with the Arkansas, and seem inclined to make a permanent settlement and incorporate themselves with that nation. The number is unknown, but is considerable, and is every day increasing.

On the river St. Francis, in the neighbourhood of New-Madrid, Cape Girardeau, Reviere a la Pomme, and the environs, are settled a number of vagabonds, emigrants from the Delawares, Shawnese, Miamis, Chickasaws, Cherokees, Piorias, and supposed to consist in all of five hundred families: they are at times troublesome to the boats descending the river, and have even plundered some of them, and committed a few murders. They are attached to liquor, seldom remain long in any place, many of them speak English, all understand it, and there are some who even read and write it.

At St. Genevieve, in the settlement among the whites, are about thirty Piorias, Kaskaskias, and Illinois, who seldom hunt, for fear of the other Indians: they are the remains of a nation which, fifty years ago, could bring into the field one thousand two hundred warriors.

On the Missouri.— On the Missouri and its waters are many and numerous nations, the best known of which are: the Osages, situated on the river of same name, on the right bank of the Missouri, at about eighty leagues from its confluence with it: they consist of one thousand warriors, who live in two settlements at no great distance from each other. They are of a gigantic stature and well proportioned, are enemies of the whites and of all other Indian nations, and commit depredations from the Illinois to the Arkansas. The trade of this nation is said to be under an exclusive grant. They are a cruel and ferocious race, and are hated and feared by all the other Indians. The confluence of the Osage River with the Missouri is about eight leagues from the Mississippi.

Sixty leagues higher up the Missouri, and on the same bank, is the river Kanzas, and on it the nation of the same name, but at about seventy or eighty leagues from its mouth. It consists of about two hundred and fifty warriors, who are as fierce and cruel as the Osages, and often molest and ill-treat those who go to trade among them.

Sixty leagues above the river Kanzas, and at about two hundred from the mouth of the Missouri, still on the right bank, is the *rivierre Platte*, or Shallow River, remarkable for its quicksands and bad navigation; and near its confluence with the Missouri dwells the nation of Octolactos, commonly called Otos, consisting of about two hundred warriors, among whom are twenty-five or thirty of the nation of Missouri, who took refuge among them about twenty-five years since.

Forty leagues up the *river Platte* you come to the nation of the Panis, composed of about seven hundred warriors in four neighbouring villages. They hunt but little and are ill provided with fire-arms: they often make war on the Spaniards in the neighbourhood of Santa Fe, from which they are not far distant.

At three hundred leagues from the Mississippi and one hundred from the *river Platte*, on the same bank, are situated the villages of the Mahas. They consisted in 1799 of five hundred warriors, but are said to have been almost cut off last year by the small-pox.

At fifty leagues above the Mahas, and on the left bank of the Missouri, dwell the Poncas, to the number of two hundred and fifty warriors, possessing in common with the Mahas their language, ferocity, and vices. Their trade has never been of much value, and those engaged to it are exposed to pillage and ill-treatment.

At the distance of 450 leagues from the Mississippi, and on the right bank of the Missouri, dwell the Aricaras, to the number of 700 warriors; and 60 leagues above them, the Mandane nation, consisting of about 700 warriors likewise. These two last nations are well disposed to the whites, but have been the victims of the Sioux, or Nandowessies, who being themselves well provided with fire-arms, have taken advantage of the defenceless situation of the others, and have on all occasions murdered them without mercy.

No discoveries on the Missouri, beyond the Mandane nation, have been accurately detailed, though the traders have been

informed that many large navigable rivers discharge their waters into it, far above it, and that there are many numerous nations settled on them.

The Sioux, or Mandowessies, who frequent the country between the north bank of the Missouri and Mississippi, are a great impediment to trade and navigation. They endeavour to prevent all communication with the nations dwelling high up the Missouri, to deprive them of ammunition and arms, and thus keep them subservient to themselves. In the winter they are chiefly on the banks of the Missouri, and massacre all who fall into their hands.

There are a number of nations at a distance from the banks of the Missouri, to the north and south, concerning whom but little information has been received. Returning to the Mississippi, and ascending it from the Missouri, about 75 leagues above the mouth of the latter, the river Moingona, or Riviere de Moine, enters the Mississippi on the west side; and on it are situated the Ayoas, a nation originally from the Missouri, speaking the language of the Otachatas. It consisted of 200 warriors before the small-pox lately raged among them.

The Saes and Renards dwell on the Mississippi, about 300 leagues above St. Louis, and frequently trade with it. They live together, and consisted of 500 warriors: their chief trade is with Michilimakinac, and they have always been peaceable and friendly.

The other nations on the Mississippi higher up, are but little known to us. The nations of the Missouri, though cruel, treacherous, and insolent, may doubtless be kept in order by the United States if proper regulations are adopted with respect to them.

It is said that no treaties have been entered into by Spain with the Indian nations westward of the Mississippi, and that its treaties with the Creeks, Choctaws, &c., are in effect superceded by our treaty with that power of the 27th October, 1795.

Of Lands and Titles.— The lands are held in some instances by grants from the crown, but mostly from the colonial government. Perhaps not one-quarter part of the lands granted in Louisiana are held by complete titles; and of the remainder a considerable part depends upon a written permission of a commandant. Not a small proportion is held by occupancy with a single verbal permission of the officer last mentioned. This

practice has always been countenanced by the Spanish government, in order that poor men, when they found themselves a little at ease, might, at their own conveniencey, apply for and obtain complete titles. In the mean time such imperfect rights were suffered by the government to descend by inheritance, and even to be transferred by private contract. When requisite, they have been seized by judicial authority, and sold for the payment of debts.

Until within a few years the governor of Upper Louisiana was authorized to make surveys of any extent. In the exercise of this discretionary power, some abuses were committed; a few small monopolies were created. About three years ago he was restricted in this branch of his duty, since which he has been only authorised to make surveys to emigrants in the following manner: two hundred acres for each man and wife, fifty acres for each child, and twenty acres for each slave. Hence the quantity of land allowed to settlers depended on the number in each family; and for this quantity of land they paid no more than the expense of survey. These surveys were necessary to entitle the settlers to grants; and the governor, and after him the intendant at New-Orleans, was alone authorised to execute grants on the receipt of the surveys from the settlers. The administration of the land-office is at present under the care of the intendant of the province.

There are no feudal rights nor noblesse.

It is impossible to ascertain the quantity of lands granted, without calling on the claimants to exhibit their titles. The registry being incomplete, and the maps made by the different surveyors-general having been burnt in the fires of New-Orleans of 1788 and 1794, no estimate has been obtained.

All the lands on both sides of the Mississippi from the distance of sixteen leagues below New-Orleans to Baton-Rouge are granted to the depth of forty acres, or near half a league, which is the usual depth of all grants. Some have double and triple grants,— that is to say, they have twice or thrice forty acres in depth; and others have grants extending from the Mississippi to the sea or the lakes behind them. In other parts of the country the people, being generally settled on the banks of creeks or rivers, have a front of from six to forty acres, and the grant almost invariably expresses a depth of forty acres. All the lands ungranted in the island of New-

Orleans or on the opposite bank of the Mississippi are sunken, inundated, and at present unfit for cultivation, but may, in part, be reclaimed at a future day by efforts of the rich and enterprising.

Cultivation of Sugar.— The sugar-cane may be cultivated between the river Iberville and the city, on both sides of the river, and as far back as the swamps. Below the city, however, the lands decline so rapidly that beyond fifteen miles the soil is not well adapted to it. Above the Iberville the cane would be affected by the cold, and its produce would therefore be uncertain. Within these limits the best planters admit that one-quarter of the cultivated lands of any considerable plantation may be planted in cane, one-quarter left in pasture, and the remaining half employed for provisions, &c., and a reserve for a change of crops. One Parisian arpent of one hundred and eighty feet square may be expected to produce, on an average, twelve hundred weight of sugar and fifty gallons of rum.

From the above data, admitting that both sides of the river are planted for ninety miles in extent and about three-fourths of a mile in depth, it will result that the annual product may amount in round numbers to twenty-five thousand hogsheads of sugar, with twelve thousand puncheons of rum. Enterprising young planters say that one-third or even one-half of the arable land might be planted in cane. It may also be remarked that a regular supply of provisions from above at a moderate price would enable the planter to give his attention to a greater body of land cultivated with cane. The whole of these lands, as may be supposed, are granted ; but in the Atacapas country there is undoubtedly a portion, parallel to the seacoast, fit for the culture of the sugar-cane. There vacant lands are to be found, but the proportion is at present unknown.

In the above remarks the lands at Terre aux Bœuf, on the Fourche, Bayou St. Jean, and other inlets of the Mississippi, south of the latitude supposed to divide those which are fit from those which are unfit for the cultivation of the cane, have been entirely kept out of view. Including these and taking one-third instead of one-fourth of the lands fit for sugar, the produce of the whole would be fifty thousand instead of twenty-five thousand hogsheads of sugar.

The following quantities of sugar, brown, clayed, and refined,

have been imported into the United States from Louisiana and the Floridas, viz.: —

In 1799	- - - - -	773,542 *lb.*
1800	- - - - -	1,560,865
1801	- - - - -	967,619
1802	- - - - -	1,576,933

Of the Laws.— When the country was first ceded to Spain, she preserved many of the French regulations, but by almost imperceptible degrees they have disappeared, and at present the province is governed entirely by the laws of Spain, and the ordinances formed expressly for the colony. Various ordinances promulgated by General O'Reilly, its first governor under Spain, as well as some other laws, are translated, and annexed in the appendix, No. 1.

Courts of Justice.—The governor's court has a civil and military jurisdiction throughout the province. That of the lieutenant governor has the same extent in civil cases only.

There are two alcades, whose jurisdiction, civil and criminal, extends through the city of New-Orleans and 5 leagues around it, where the parties have no *fuero militar*, or military privilege: those who have can transfer their causes to the governor.

The tribunal of the Intendant has cognizance of admiralty and fiscal causes, and such suits as are brought for the recovery of money in the king's name or against him.

The tribunal of the Alcade Provincial has cognizance of criminal causes, where offences are committed in the country, or when the criminal takes refuge there, and in other specified cases.

The ecclesiastical tribunal has jurisdiction in all matters respecting the church.

The governor, lieutenant governor, Alcades, Intendant, Provincial Alcade, and the Provisor in ecclesiastical causes are respectively sole judges. All sentences affecting the life of the culprit, except those of the Alcade Provincial, must be ratified by the superior tribunal, or captain-general, according to the nature of the cause, before they are carried into execution. The governor has not the power of pardoning criminals. An auditor and an assessor, who are doctors of law, are appointed to give counsel to those judges; but for some time past there has been no assessor. If the judges do not consult

those officers or do not follow their opinions, they make themselves responsible for their decisions.

The commandants of districts have also a species of judicial power. They hear and determine all pecuniary causes not exceeding the value of one hundred dollars. When the suit is for a larger sum, they commence the process, collect the proofs, and remit the whole to the governor, to be decided by the proper tribunal. They can inflict no corporal punishment except upon slaves; but they have the power of arresting and imprisoning when they think it necessary, advice of which and their reasons must be transmitted to the governor.

Small suits are determined in a summary way by hearing both parties *viva voce;* but in suits of greater magnitude the proceedings are carried on by petition and reply, replication and rejoinder, reiterated until the auditor thinks they have nothing new to say. Then all the proofs either party chooses to adduce are taken before the keeper of the records of the court, who is always a notary public.

The parties have now an opportunity of making their remarks upon the evidence by way of petition, and of bringing forward opposing proofs. When the auditor considers the cause as mature, he issues his decree, which receives its binding force from the governor's signature, where the cause depends upon him.

There is an appeal to Havanna, if applied for within five days after the date of the decree, in causes above a certain value. An ulterior appeal lies to the Audience which formerly sat at St. Domingo, but which is now removed to some part of Cuba, and from thence to the council of the Indies in Spain.

Suits are of various durations. In pecuniary matters the laws encourage summary proceedings. An execution may be had on a bond in four days and in the same space on a note of hand after the party acknowledges it, or after his signature is proved. Moveable property is sold after giving nine days' warning, provided it be three times publicly cried in that interval. Landed property must be likewise cried three times, with an interval of nine days between each; and it may then be sold. All property taken in execution must be appraised and sold for at least half of the appraisement. In pecuniary matters the governors decide verbally without appeal, when the sum does not exceed one hundred dollars. The Alcades have the same privilege when the amount is not above twenty dollars.

In addition to these courts, four years ago there were established four Alcades de Barrio, or petty magistrates, one for each of the four quarters of the city, with a view to improve its police. They hear and decide all demands not exceeding ten dollars, exercise the power of committing to prison, and, in case of robbery, riot, or assassination, they can, by calling on a notary, take cognizance of the affair; but, when this is done, they are bound to remit the proceedings to some of the other judges, and in all cases whatever to give them information when they have committed any person to prison.

Most of the suits are on personal contracts, rights to dower, inheritances, and titles to land. Those arising from personal quarrels are generally decided in a summary way. The inhabitants are said not to be litigious. . . .

Learning.—There are no colleges, and but one public school, which is at New-Orleans. The masters of this are paid by the king. They teach the Spanish language only. There are a few private schools for children. Not more than half of the inhabitants are supposed to be able to read and write, of whom not more than two hundred perhaps are able to do it well. In general, the learning of the inhabitants does not extend beyond those two arts, though they seem to be endowed with a good natural genius and an uncommon facility of learning whatever they undertake.

The Church.— The clergy consists of a bishop, who does not reside in the province, and whose salary of four thousand dollars is charged on the revenue of certain bishopricks in Mexico and Cuba; two canons, having each a salary of six hundred dollars; and twenty-five curates, five for the city of New-Orleans and twenty for as many country parishes, who receive each from three hundred and sixty to four hundred and eighty dollars a year. Those salaries, except that of the bishop, together with an allowance for sacristans and chapel expences, are paid by the treasury at New-Orleans, and amount annually to thirteen thousand dollars.

There is also at that place a convent of Ursalines, to which is attached about a thousand acres of land, rented out in three plantations. The nuns are now in number not more than ten or twelve, and are all French. There were formerly about the same number of Spanish ladies belonging to the order, but they retired to Havanna during the period when it was expected that the province would be transferred to France. The

remaining nuns receive young ladies as boarders, and instruct them in reading, writing, and needle-work.

They have always acted with great propriety, and are generally respected and beloved throughout the province. With the assistance of an annual allowance of six hundred dollars from the treasury, they always support and educate twelve female orphans.

THE LOUISIANA TERRITORY.

From McMaster's History of the People of the United States, Vol. II., 631.

The Province of Louisiana, as the region came to be called, was to the Americans of that day an unknown land. Not a boundary was defined. Not a scrap of trustworthy information concerning the region was to be obtained. Meagre accounts of what travellers had seen on the Missouri, of what hunters and trappers knew of the upper Mississippi, of what the Indians said were the features of the great plains that stretched away toward the setting sun, had indeed reached the officials; and out of these was constructed the most remarkable document any President has ever transmitted to Congress. It told of a tribe of Indians of gigantic stature; of tall bluffs faced with stone and carved by the hand of Nature into what seemed a multitude of antique towers; of land so fertile as to yield the necessaries of life almost spontaneously; of an immense prairie covered with buffalo, and producing nothing but grass because the soil was far too rich for the growth of trees; and how a thousand miles up the Missouri was a vast mountain of salt. The length was one hundred and eighty miles; the breadth was forty-five. Not a tree, not so much as a shrub, was on it; but, all glittering white, it rose from the earth a solid mountain of rock salt, with streams of saline water flowing from the fissures and cavities at its base. The story, the account admitted, might well seem incredible; but, unhappily for the doubters, bushels of the salt had been shown by traders to the people at St. Louis and Marietta.

Even this assurance failed to convince the Federalists. Everywhere they read the story with the scoffs and jeers it so richly deserved. Can the mountain, one journal asked, be

Lot's wife? Has the President, asked another, been reading the "Mysteries of Udolpho"? What a dreadful glare it must make on a sunshiny day! exclaimed a third. No trees on it? How strange! There ought surely to be a salt eagle to perch on the summit and a salt mammoth to clamber up its side. The President, being a cautious philosopher, has surely been afraid to tell us all. He must have kept much back, else we should have seen some samples from that vale of hasty-pudding and that lake of real old Irish usquebaugh that lies at the mountain's base. The stories told fourteen years since about the Ohio country are now surpassed. The pumpkin-vines, the hoop-snakes, the shoe-and-stocking tree of the Muskingum, are but "pepper-corns" beside the mountain of salt.

Bad as was the Federal wit, the labored attempts of the Republican journals to prove the existence of the mountain were more stupid still. The fact was pronounced undoubted. Bits of the salt had reached the President; nay, were to be seen at Washington, at New York, at Boston among the curiosities of Mr. Turell's museum. There the editor of the *Columbian Centinel* had the impudence to assure his readers he had seen a piece the size of a hen's egg from the banks of the Missouri. But one had the courage and good sense to declare the story was half a fable. The editor of the *National Ægis* did not, he asserted, for a moment believe that a huge mountain of salt stood gleaming and glittering in the sun. The deposit was probably a great deep mine, a mountain in extent underground. Neither the President nor any member of the government had explored Louisiana. In describing the country, such facts had to be used as were supplied by travellers, and that class of travellers so much disposed to magnify mole-hills into mountains. What wonder, then, that some fabulous embellishments crept into the account which, undoubtedly, the President sent to Congress without reading through!

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

From Henry Adams's History of the United States, II. 48.

Livingston had achieved the greatest diplomatic success recorded in American history. Neither Franklin, Jay, Gallatin, nor any other American diplomatist was so fortunate as Living-

ston for the immensity of his results compared with the paucity of his means. Other treaties of immense consequence have been signed by American representatives,— the treaty of alliance with France; the treaty of peace with England, which recognized independence; the treaty of Ghent; the treaty which ceded Florida; the Ashburton treaty; the treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo,— but in none of these did the United States government get so much for so little. The annexation of Louisiana was an event so portentous as to defy measurement. It gave a new face to politics, and ranked in historical importance next to the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the Constitution,— events of which it was the logical outcome; but as a matter of diplomacy it was unparalleled, because it cost almost nothing.

The purchase of the Louisiana territory in 1803 constituted the first great chapter in the history of our national expansion. This purchase doubled the area of the United States, adding over 900,000 square miles. It comprised almost the entire region between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains, north of Texas,— the territory out of which have since been formed the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, North and South Dakota, with a great part of the States of Minnesota and Colorado, and also the Indian Territory, including Oklahoma. By a secret convention in 1762, confirmed by the Treaty of Paris in 1763, France had given this vast territory to Spain; and the control which Spain thus had of the mouth of the Mississippi became, as years went on, a matter of more and more serious concern to our Western people, for whom the Mississippi and its tributaries were the great avenues of travel and of trade. Our sagacious statesmen saw early what serious consequences might be involved in the situation. Franklin said to Jay in 1784: "I would rather agree with the Spaniards to buy at a great price the whole of their right on the Mississippi than sell a drop of its waters. A neighbor might as well ask me to sell my street-door." Jefferson devoted his earnest thought to the subject years before 1803. As Secretary of State in 1790, when there seemed to be some danger of Great Britain seizing New Orleans, he expressed to Washington his opinion that, rather than see Louisiana and Florida added to the British Empire, we should take part in the general war which then seemed impending; and at the same time he warned the French to let the territory alone. In 1801 Spain, by a secret treaty, ceded the territory back to France. Napoleon planned a great expedition and colony for Louisiana, and had ambitious thoughts of the restoration in America of the French power which fell before England at Quebec. The intimations of the cession from Spain to France created much disturbance and alarm in America. "Kentucky was in a flame. The President was deeply stirred. The Spaniards had retained Louisiana on sufferance: the United States could have it at *any* time from *them*. But the French would be likely to hold their ancient possessions with a tighter clutch, and not content themselves with two or three trading-posts in a fertile territory large enough for an empire. Jefferson, from the hour when the intelligence reached him, had only this thought: The French must not have New Orleans. No one but ourselves must own our own street-door." He addressed urgent instructions and suggestions to Mr. Livingston, our minister at Paris, embodying considerations which he knew would find their way to Napoleon. The United States could not let the French control the mouth of the Mississippi, and a conflict about it might finally necessitate an alliance of some sort between ourselves and Great Britain.

Early in 1803 Jefferson sent Mr. Monroe, as a special ambassador, to join Mr. Livingstone in Paris, charged with the fullest instructions, and authorized to give two million dollars, if he could do no better, for the island of New Orleans alone. Monroe arrived to find France on the eve of war with England, and Napoleon in active negotiations with Livingston for the transfer to the United States of the whole of Louisiana. Napoleon knew that the British fleet could easily keep French forces away from the Mississippi; and, rather than have Great Britain seize Louisiana, he would sell it to the United States, getting what money he could out of it for use in the impending war. "I know the full value of Lou-

isiana," he said, "and I have been desirous of repairing the fault of the French negotiators who abandoned it in 1763. But, if it escapes from me, it shall one day cost dearer to those who oblige me to strip myself of it than to those to whom I wish to deliver it. The English have successively taken from France Canada, Cape Breton, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and the richest portions of Asia. They shall not have the Mississippi, which they covet. . . I already consider the colony as entirely lost; and it appears to me that, in the hands of this growing power, it will be more useful to the policy and even to the commerce of France than if I should attempt to keep it." "I have given to England," he said afterward, "a maritime rival that will, sooner or later, humble her pride." The terms of the sale — "probably the largest transaction in real estate which the world has ever known" — were agreed upon after considerable bickering, the sum paid by the United States being fifteen million dollars. The treaty contained a positive provision that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States." M. Marbois, the French minister, relates that, as soon as the three negotiators had signed the treaties, they all rose, and shook hands; and Mr. Livingston gave utterance to the joy and satisfaction of them all, saying: —

"We have lived long, but this is the noblest work of our whole lives. The treaty which we have just signed has not been obtained by art nor dictated by force, and is equally advantageous to the two contracting parties. It will change vast solitudes into flourishing districts. From this day the United States take their place among the powers of the first rank. The United States will re-establish the maritime rights of all the world, which are now usurped by a single nation. The instruments which we have just signed will cause no tears to be shed: they prepare ages of happiness for innumerable generations of human creatures. The Mississippi and the Missouri will see them succeed one another and multiply, truly worthy of the regard and care of Providence, in the bosom of equality, under just laws, freed from the errors of superstition and bad government."

The general ignorance concerning the Louisiana territory, on the part of the American people at the time of the purchase, was very great: even the boundaries were far from being clearly defined. For the sake of furnishing the best information available, Jefferson had prepared and submitted to Congress the document whose more important portions are reprinted in the present leaflet. Besides what is here given, the document contained accounts of the existing political organization, of the exports, imports, and navigation, and, in an appendix, census details and other matter. The document, which performed for that time a function similar to that of the report of the Philippine Commission in our time, was printed in pamphlet form by various publishers for general circulation. The edition used for the present reprint was published by John Conrad and Company of Philadelphia, 1803.

The best general account of the purchase of Louisiana and of the debates and legislation incident to it is that by Henry Adams in his History of the United States during the Administration of Thomas Jefferson, vol. ii. See also Cooley's "Acquisition of Louisiana." The subject has prominent place in all the biographies of Jefferson. There is an excellent brief account in Gilman's Life of Monroe, in the American Statesmen Series; and the bibliography of the subject, by Professor J. F. Jameson, in the appendix to that volume, is the best to which the student can be referred. See also the references in the valuable chapter on "Territorial Acquisitions and Divisions," by Justin Winsor and Professor Edward Channing, in the Narrative and Critical History of America, vol. vii. The original letters of Livingston and Monroe, giving accounts of the negotiations in Paris, appear in the American State Papers, Foreign Relations, ii.; and there is a history of the cession by Barbé-Marbois, one of the French negotiators.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

116

Old South Leaflets.

No. 106.

The Government of the United States.

By JOHN C. CALHOUN.

From Calhoun's "Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States."

Ours is a system of government, compounded of the separate governments of the several States composing the Union, and of one common government of all its members, called the Government of the United States. The former preceded the latter, which was created by their agency. Each was framed by written constitutions; those of the several States by the people of each, acting separately, and in their sovereign character; and that of the United States, by the same, acting in the same character,—but jointly instead of separately. All were formed on the same model. They all divide the powers of government into legislative, executive, and judicial; and are founded on the great principle of the responsibility of the rulers to the ruled. The entire powers of government are divided between the two; those of a more general character being specifically delegated to the United States; and all others not delegated, being reserved to the several States in their separate character. Each, within its appropriate sphere, possesses all the attributes, and performs all the functions of government. Neither is perfect without the other. The two combined, form one entire and perfect government. With these preliminary remarks, I shall proceed to the consideration of the immediate subject of this discourse.

The Government of the United States was formed by the Constitution of the United States; — and ours is a democratic, federal republic.

It is democratic, in contradistinction to aristocracy and monarchy. It excludes classes, orders, and all artificial distinctions. To guard against their introduction, the constitution prohibits the granting of any title of nobility by the United States, or by any State.* The whole system is, indeed, democratic throughout. It has for its fundamental principle, the great cardinal maxim, that the people are the source of all power; that the governments of the several States and of the United States were created by them, and for them; that the powers conferred on them are not surrendered, but delegated; and, as such, are held in trust, and not absolutely; and can be rightfully exercised only in furtherance of the objects for which they were delegated.

It is federal as well as democratic. *Federal*, on the one hand, in contradistinction to *national*, and, on the other, to a *confederacy*. In showing this, I shall begin with the former.

It is federal, because it is the government of States united in a political union, in contradistinction to a government of individuals socially united; that is, by what is usually called, a social compact. To express it more concisely, it is federal and not national, because it is the government of a community of States, and not the government of a single State or nation.

That it is federal and not national, we have the high authority of the convention which framed it. General Washington, as its organ, in his letter submitting the plan to the consideration of the Congress of the then confederacy, calls it, in one place,—"the general government of the Union;"—and in another,—"the federal government of these States." Taken together, the plain meaning is, that the government proposed would be, if adopted, the government of the States adopting it, in their united character as members of a common Union; and, as such, would be a federal government. These expressions were not used without due consideration, and an accurate and full knowledge of their true import. The subject was not a novel one. The convention was familiar with it. It was much agitated in their deliberations. They divided, in reference to it, in the early stages of their proceedings. At first, one party was in favor of a national and the other of a federal government. The former, in the beginning, prevailed; and in the plans which they proposed, the constitution and government

* 1st Art., 9 and 10 Sec.

are styled "National." But, finally, the latter gained the ascendency, when the term "National" was superseded, and "*United States*" substituted in its place. The constitution was accordingly styled,—"*The constitution of the United States of America:*"— and the government,—"*The government of the United States:*" leaving out "America," for the sake of brevity. It cannot admit of a doubt, that the Convention, by the expression "United States," meant the States united in a federal Union; for in no other sense could they, with propriety, call the government, "*the federal government of these States,*"— and "*the general government of the Union,*"— as they did in the letter referred to. It is thus clear, that the Convention regarded the different expressions,—"the federal government of the United States;"—"the general government of the Union,"— and,—"government of the United States,"— as meaning the same thing,— a federal, in contradistinction to a national government.

Assuming it then, as established, that they are the same, it is only necessary, in order to ascertain with precision, what they meant by "*federal government,*"— to ascertain what they meant by "*the government of the United States.*" For this purpose it will be necessary to trace the expression to its origin.

It was, at that time, as our history shows, an old and familiar phrase,— having a known and well-defined meaning. Its use commenced with the political birth of these States; and it has been applied to them, in all the forms of government through which they have passed, without alteration. The style of the present constitution and government is precisely the style by which the confederacy that existed when it was adopted, and which it superseded, was designated. The instrument that formed the latter was called,— "*Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union.*" Its first article declares that the style of this confederacy shall be, "The United States of America;" and the second, in order to leave no doubt as to the relation in which the States should stand to each other in the confederacy about to be formed, declared,— "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence; and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not, by this confederation, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." If we go one step further back, the style of the confederacy will be found to be the same with that of the revolutionary government, which existed when it was adopted, and which it

superseded. It dates its origin with the Declaration of Independence. That act is styled,— "The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen United States of America." And here again, that there might be no doubt how these States would stand to each other in the new condition in which they were about to be placed, it concluded by declaring,— "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States"; "and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." The "United States" is, then, the baptismal name of these States,— received at their birth; — by which they have ever since continued to call themselves; by which they have characterized their constitution, government and laws; — and by which they are known to the rest of the world.

The retention of the same style, throughout every stage of their existence, affords strong, if not conclusive evidence that the political relation between these States, under their present constitution and government, is substantially the same as under the confederacy and revolutionary government; and what that relation was, we are not left to doubt; as they are declared expressly to be "*free, independent* and *sovereign* States." They, then, are now united, and have been, throughout, simply as confederated States. If it had been intended by the members of the convention which framed the present constitution and government, to make any essential change, either in the relation of the States to each other, or the basis of their union, they would, by retaining the style which designated them under the preceding governments, have practised a deception, utterly unworthy of their character, as sincere and honest men and patriots. It may, therefore, be fairly inferred, that, retaining the same style, they intended to attach to the expression,— "the United States," the same meaning, substantially, which it previously had; and, of course, in calling the present government,— "the federal government of these States," they meant by "federal," that they stood in the same relation to each other,— that their union rested, without material change, on the same basis,— as under the confederacy and the revolutionary government; and that federal, and confederated States, meant substantially the same thing. It follows, also, that the changes made by the present constitution were not in the foundation, but in the superstructure of the system.

We accordingly find, in confirmation of this conclusion, that the convention, in their letter to Congress, stating the reasons for the changes that had been made, refer only to the necessity which required a different "*organization*" of the government, without making any allusion whatever to any change in the relations of the States towards each other,— or the basis of the system. They state that, "the friends of our country have long seen and desired, that the power of making war, peace, and treaties; that of levying money and regulating commerce, and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities, should be fully and effectually vested in the Government of the Union: but the impropriety of delegating such extensive trusts to one body of men is evident; hence results the necessity of a *different organization*." Comment is unnecessary.

We thus have the authority of the convention itself for asserting that the expression, "United States," has essentially the same meaning, when applied to the present constitution and government, as it had previously; and, of course, that the States have retained their separate existence, as independent and sovereign communities, in all the forms of political existence, through which they have passed. Such, indeed, is the literal import of the expression,— "the United States,"— and the sense in which it is ever used, when it is applied politically,— I say, *politically*,— because it is often applied, *geographically*, to designate the portion of this continent occupied by the States composing the Union, including territories belonging to them. This application arose from the fact, that there was no appropriate term for that portion of this continent; and thus, not unnaturally, the name by which these States are politically designated, was employed to designate the region they occupy and possess. The distinction is important, and cannot be overlooked in discussing questions involving the character and nature of the government, without causing great confusion and dangerous misconceptions.

But as conclusive as these reasons are to prove that the government of the United States is federal, in contradistinction to national, it would seem, that they have not been sufficient to prevent the opposite opinion from being entertained. Indeed, this last seems to have become the prevailing one; if we may judge from the general use of the term "national," and the almost entire disuse of that of "federal." National is now commonly applied to "the general government of the Union,"

—and "the federal government of these States,"—and all that appertains to them or to the Union. It seems to be forgotten that the term was repudiated by the convention, after full consideration; and that it was carefully excluded from the constitution, and the letter laying it before Congress. Even those who know all this,—and, of course, how falsely the term is applied,—have, for the most part, slided into its use without reflection. But there are not a few who so apply it, because they believe it to be a national government in fact; and among these are men of distinguished talents and standing, who have put forth all their powers of reason and eloquence, in support of the theory. The question involved is one of the first magnitude, and deserves to be investigated thoroughly in all its aspects. With this impression, I deem it proper,—clear and conclusive as I regard the reasons already assigned to prove its federal character,—to confirm them by historical references; and to repel the arguments adduced to prove it to be a national government. I shall begin with the formation and ratification of the constitution.

That the States, when they formed and ratified the constitution, were distinct, independent, and sovereign communities, has already been established. That the people of the several States, acting in their separate, independent, and sovereign character, adopted their separate State constitutions, is a fact uncontested and incontestable; but it is not more certain than that, acting in the same character, they ratified and adopted the constitution of the United States; with this difference only, that in making and adopting the one, they acted without concert or agreement; but, in the other, with concert in making, and mutual agreement in adopting it. That the delegates who constituted the convention which framed the constitution, were appointed by the several States, each on its own authority; that they voted in the convention by States; and that their votes were counted by States,—are recorded and unquestionable facts. So, also, the facts that the constitution, when framed, was submitted to the people of the several States for their respective ratification; that it was ratified by them, each for itself; and that it was binding on each, only in consequence of its being so ratified by it. Until then, it was but the plan of a constitution, without any binding force. It was the act of ratification which established it as a constitution between the States ratifying it; and only between *them*, on the

condition that not less than nine of the then thirteen States should concur in the ratification: — as is expressly provided by its seventh and last article. It is in the following words: "The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this constitution between the States so ratifying the same." If additional proof be needed to show that it was only binding between the States that ratified it, it may be found in the fact, that two States, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused, at first, to ratify; and were, in consequence, regarded in the interval as foreign States, without obligation, on their parts, to respect it, or, on the part of their citizens, to obey it. Thus far, there can be no difference of opinion. The facts are too recent and too well established,— and the provision of the constitution too explicit, to admit of doubt.

That the States, then, retained, after the ratification of the constitution, the distinct, independent, and sovereign character in which they formed and ratified it, is certain; unless they divested themselves of it by the act of ratification, or by some provision of the constitution. If they have not, the constitution must be federal, and not national; for it would have, in that case, every attribute necessary to constitute it federal, and not one to make it national. On the other hand, if they have divested themselves, then it would necessarily lose its federal character, and become national. Whether, then, the government is federal or national, is reduced to a single question; whether the act of ratification, of itself, or the constitution, by some one, or all of its provisions, did, or did not, divest the several States of their character of separate, independent, and sovereign communities, and merge them all in one great community or nation, called the American people?

Before entering on the consideration of this important question, it is proper to remark, that, on its decision, the character of the government, as well as the constitution, depends. The former must, necessarily, partake of the character of the latter, as it is but its agent, created by it, to carry its powers into effect. Accordingly, then, as the constitution is federal or national, so must the government be; and I shall, therefore, use them indiscriminately in discussing the subject.

Of all the questions which can arise under our system of government, this is by far the most important. It involves many others of great magnitude; and among them, that of the

allegiance of the citizen; or, in other words, the question to whom allegiance and obedience are ultimately due. What is the true relation between the two governments,— that of the United States, and those of the several States? and what is the relation between the individuals respectively composing them? For it is clear, if the States still retain their sovereignty as separate and independent communities, the allegiance and obedience of the citizens of each would be due to their respective States; and that the government of the United States and those of the several States would stand as equals and co-ordinates in their respective spheres; and, instead of being united socially, their citizens would be politically connected through their respective States. On the contrary, if they have, by ratifying the constitution, divested themselves of their individuality and sovereignty, and merged themselves into one great community or nation, it is equally clear, that the sovereignty would reside in the whole,— or what is called the American people; and that allegiance and obedience would be due to them. Nor is it less so, that the government of the several States would, in such case, stand to that of the United States, in the relation of inferior and subordinate, to superior and paramount; and that the individuals of the several States, thus fused, as it were, into one general mass, would be united *socially*, and not *politically*. So great a change of condition would have involved a thorough and radical revolution, both socially and politically,— a revolution much more radical, indeed, than that which followed the Declaration of Independence.

They who maintain that the ratification of the constitution effected so mighty a change, are bound to establish it by the most demonstrative proof. The presumption is strongly opposed to it. It has already been shown, that the authority of the convention which formed the constitution is clearly against it; and that the history of its ratification, instead of supplying evidence in its favor, furnishes strong testimony in opposition to it. To these, others may be added; and, among them, the presumption drawn from the history of these States, in all the stages of their existence down to the time of the ratification of the constitution. In all, they formed separate, and, as it respects each other, independent communities; and were ever remarkable for the tenacity with which they adhered to their rights as such. It constituted, during the whole period, one

of the most striking traits in their character,—as a very brief sketch will show.

During their colonial condition, they formed distinct communities,—each with its separate charter and government,—and in no way connected with each other, except as dependent members of a common empire. Their first union amongst themselves was, in resistance to the encroachments of the parent country on their chartered rights,—when they adopted the title of,—"the United Colonies." Under that name they acted, until they declared their independence;—always, in their joint councils, voting and acting as separate and distinct communities;—and not in the aggregate, as composing one community or nation. They acted in the same character in declaring independence; by which act they passed from their dependent, colonial condition, into that of free and sovereign States. The declaration was made by delegates appointed by the several colonies, each for itself, and on its own authority. The vote making the declaration was taken by delegations, each counting one. The declaration was announced to be unanimous, not because every delegate voted for it, but because the majority of each delegation did; showing clearly, that the body itself, regarded it as the united act of the several colonies, and not the act of the whole as one community. To leave no doubt on a point so important, and in reference to which the several colonies were so tenacious, the declaration was made in the name, and by the authority of the people of the colonies, represented in Congress; and that was followed by declaring them to be,—"free and independent States." The act was, in fact, but a formal and solemn annunciation to the world, that the colonies had ceased to be dependent communities, and had become free and independent States; without involving any other change in their relations with each other, than those necessarily incident to a separation from the parent country. So far were they from supposing, or intending that it should have the effect of merging their existence, as separate communities, into one nation, that they had appointed a committee,—which was actually sitting, while the declaration was under discussion,—to prepare a plan of a confederacy of the States, preparatory to entering into their new condition. In fulfilment of their appointment, this committee prepared the draft of the articles of confederation and perpetual union, which afterwards was adopted by the governments of the

several States. That it instituted a mere confederacy and union of the States has already been shown. That, in forming and assenting to it, the States were exceedingly jealous and watchful in delegating power, even to a confederacy: that they granted the powers delegated most reluctantly and sparingly; that several of them long stood out, under all the pressure of the revolutionary war, before they acceded to it: and that, during the interval which elapsed between its adoption and that of the present constitution, they evinced, under the most urgent necessity, the same reluctance and jealousy, in delegating power,— are facts which cannot be disputed.

To this may be added another circumstance of no little weight, drawn from the preliminary steps taken for the ratification of the constitution. The plan was laid, by the convention, before the Congress of the confederacy, for its consideration and action, as has been stated. It was the sole organ and representative of these States in their confederated character. By submitting it, the convention recognized and acknowledged its authority over it, as the organ of distinct, independent, and sovereign States. It had the right to dispose of it as it pleased; and, if it had thought proper, it might have defeated the plan by simply omitting to act on it. But it thought proper to act, and to adopt the course recommended by the convention; — which was, to submit it,—"to a convention of delegates, chosen in each State, by the people thereof, for their assent and adoption." All this was in strict accord with the federal character of the constitution, but wholly repugnant to the idea of its being national. It received the assent of the States in all the possible modes in which it could be obtained: first,— in their confederated character, through its only appropriate organ, the Congress; next, in their individual character, as separate States, through their respective State governments, to which the Congress referred it; and finally, in their high character of independent and sovereign communities, through a convention of the people, called in each State, by the authority of its government. The States acting in these various capacities, might, at every stage, have defeated it or not, at their option, by giving or withholding their consent.

With this weight of presumptive evidence, to use no stronger expression, in favor of its federal, in contradistinction to its national character, I shall next proceed to show, that the ratification of the constitution, instead of furnishing proof against, contains additional and conclusive evidence in its favor.

We are not left to conjecture, as to what was meant by the ratification of the constitution, or its effects. The expressions used by the conventions of the States, in ratifying it, and those used by the constitution in connection with it, afford ample means of ascertaining with accuracy, both its meaning and effect. The usual form of expression used by the former is: — "We, the delegates of the State," (naming the State,) "do, in behalf of the people of the State, assent to, and ratify the said constitution." All use, "ratify,"— and all, except North Carolina, use, "assent to." The delegates of that State use, "adopt," instead of "assent to;" a variance merely in the form of expression, without, in any degree, affecting the meaning. Ratification was, then, the act of the several States in their separate capacity. It was performed by delegates appointed expressly for the purpose. Each appointed its own delegates; and the delegates of each, acted in the name of, and for the State appointing them. Their act consisted in, "assenting to," or, what is the same thing, "adopting and ratifying" the constitution.

By turning to the seventh article of the constitution, and to the preamble, it will be found what was the effect of ratifying. The article expressly provides, that, "the ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this constitution, between the States so ratifying the same." The preamble of the constitution is in the following words; — "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." The effect, then, of its ratification was, to ordain and establish the constitution; — and, thereby, to make, what was before but a plan,—"The constitution of the United States of America." All this is clear.

It remains now to show, *by whom*, it was ordained and established; *for whom*, it was ordained and established; *for what*, it was ordained and established; and *over whom*, it was ordained and established. These will be considered in the order in which they stand.

Nothing more is necessary, in order to show by whom it was ordained and established, than to ascertain who are meant by, —"We, the people of the United States;" for, by their author-

ity, it was done. To this there can be but one answer: — it meant the people who ratified the instrument: for it was the act of ratification which ordained and established it. Who they were, admits of no doubt. The process preparatory to ratification, and the acts by which it was done, prove, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that it was ratified by the several States, through conventions of delegates, chosen in each State by the people thereof; and acting, each in the name and by the authority of its State: and, as all the States ratified it,— "We, the people of the United States,"— mean,— We, the people of the several States of the Union. The inference is irresistible. And when it is considered that the States of the Union were then members of the confederacy,— and that, by the express provision of one of its articles, "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence," the proof is demonstrative, that,— "We, the people of the United States of America," mean the people of the several States of the Union, acting as free, independent, and sovereign States. This strikingly confirms what has been already stated; to wit, that the convention which formed the constitution, meant the same thing by the terms,— "United States,"— and, "federal,"— when applied to the constitution or government; — and that the former, when used politically, always mean,— these States united as independent and sovereign communities.

Having shown, *by whom*, it was ordained, there will be no difficulty in determining, *for whom*, it was ordained. The preamble is explicit; — it was ordained and established for,— "The United States of America;" adding, "America," in conformity to the style of the then confederacy, and the Declaration of Independence. Assuming, then, that the "United States" bears the same meaning in the conclusion of the preamble, as it does in its commencement, (and no reason can be assigned why it should not,) it follows, necessarily, that the constitution was ordained and established *for* the people of the several States, *by* whom it was ordained and established.

Nor will there be any difficulty in showing, *for what*, it was ordained and established. The preamble enumerates the objects. They are,— "to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To effect these objects, they ordained and established, to use their own lan-

guage,— "the constitution for the United States of America;" — clearly meaning by "for," that it was intended to be *their* constitution; and that the objects of ordaining and establishing it were, to perfect *their* union, to establish justice among *them* — to insure *their* domestic tranquillity, to provide for *their* common defence and general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to *them* and *their* posterity. Taken all together, it follows, from what has been stated, that the constitution was ordained and established *by* the several States, as *distinct, sovereign communities;* and that it was ordained and established by them for *themselves* — for their common welfare and safety, as *distinct and sovereign communities.*

It remains to be shown, *over whom*, it was ordained and established. That it was not over *the several States*, is settled by the seventh article beyond controversy. It declares, that the ratification by nine States shall be sufficient to establish the constitution between the States so ratifying. "Between," necessarily excludes "*over:*" — as that which is *between* States cannot be *over* them. Reason itself, if the constitution had been silent, would have led, with equal certainty, to the same conclusion. For it was the several States, or, what is the same thing, their people, in their sovereign capacity, who ordained and established the constitution. But the authority which ordains and establishes, is higher than that which is ordained and established; and, of course, the latter must be subordinate to the former; — and cannot, therefore, be *over* it. "Between," always means more than over; — and implies in this case, that the authority which ordained and established the constitution, was the joint and united authority of the States ratifying it; and that, among the effects of their ratification, it became a contract between them; and, *as a compact*, binding on them; — but only as such. In that sense the term, "between," is appropriately applied. In no other, can it be. It was, doubtless, used in that sense in this instance; but the question still remains, *over whom*, was it ordained and established? After what has been stated, the answer may be readily given. It was *over the government* which it created, and all its functionaries in their official character,— and the individuals composing and inhabiting the several States, as far as they might come within the sphere of the powers delegated to the United States.

I have now shown, conclusively, by arguments drawn from the act of ratification, and the constitution itself, that the sev-

eral States of the Union, acting in their confederated character, ordained and established the constitution; that they ordained and established it for themselves, in the same character; that they ordained and established it for their welfare and safety, in the like character; that they established it as a compact *between* them, and not as a constitution *over* them; and that, as a compact, they are parties to it, in the same character. I have thus established, conclusively, that these States, in ratifying the constitution, did not lose the confederated character which they possessed when they ratified it, as well as in all the preceding stages of their existence: but, on the contrary, still retained it to the full.

Those who oppose this conclusion, and maintain the national character of the government, rely, in support of their views, mainly on the expressions, "we, the people of the United States," used in the first part of the preamble; and, "do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America," used in its conclusion. Taken together, they insist, in the first place, that, "we, the people," mean, the people in their individual character, as forming a single community; and that, "the United States of America," designates them in their aggregate character, as the American people. In maintaining this construction, they rely on the omission to enumerate the States by name, after the word "people," (so as to make it read, "We, the people of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, &c.," as was done in the articles of the confederation, and, also, in signing the Declaration of Independence;) — and, instead of this, the simple use of the general term "United States."

However plausible this may appear, an explanation perfectly satisfactory may be given, why the expression, as it now stands, was used by the framers of the constitution; and why it should not receive the meaning attempted to be placed upon it. It is conceded that, if the enumeration of the States after the word, "people," had been made, the expression would have been freed from all ambiguity; and the inference and argument founded on the failure to do so, left without pretext or support. The omission is certainly striking, but it can be readily explained. It was made intentionally, and solely from the necessity of the case. The first draft of the constitution contained an enumeration of the States, by name, after the word "people;" but it became impossible to retain it after

the adoption of the seventh and last article, which provided, that the ratification by nine States should be sufficient to establish the constitution as between *them*; and for the plain reason, that it was impossible to determine, whether all the States would ratify; — or, if any failed, which, and how many of the number; or, if nine should ratify, how to designate them. No alternative was thus left but to omit the enumeration, and to insert the "United States of America," in its place. And yet, an omission, so readily and so satisfactorily explained, has been seized on, as furnishing strong proof that the government was ordained and established by the American people, in the aggregate,— and is therefore national.

But the omission, of itself, would have caused no difficulty, had there not been connected with it a twofold ambiguity in the expression as it now stands. The term "*United States*," which always means, in constitutional language, the several States in their confederated character, means also, as has been shown, when applied geographically, the country occupied and possessed by them. While the term "people," has, in the English language, no plural, and is necessarily used in the singular number, even when applied to many communities or states confederated in a common union,— as is the case with the United States. Availing themselves of this double ambiguity, and the omission to enumerate the States by name, the advocates of the national theory of the government, assuming that, "*we, the people*," meant individuals generally, and not people as forming States; and that "*United States*" was used in a geographical and not a political sense, made out an argument of some plausibility, in favor of the conclusion that, "we, the people of the United States of America," meant the aggregate population of the States regarded *en masse*, and not in their distinctive character as forming separate political communities. But in this gratuitous assumption, and the conclusion drawn from it, they overlooked the stubborn fact, that the very people who ordained and established the constitution, are identically the same who ratified it; for it was by the act of ratification alone, that it was ordained and established,— as has been conclusively shown. This fact, of itself, sweeps away every vestige of the argument drawn from the ambiguity of those terms, as used in the preamble.

They next rely, in support of their theory, on the expression, —"ordained and established this constitution." They admit

that the constitution, in its incipient state, assumed the form of a compact; but contend that, "ordained and established," as applied to the constitution and government, are incompatible with the idea of compact; that, consequently, the instrument or plan lost its federative character when it was ordained and established as a constitution; and, thus, the States ceased to be parties to a compact, and members of a confederated union, and became fused into one common community, or nation, as subordinate and dependent divisions or corporations.

I do not deem it necessary to discuss the question whether there is any incompatibility between the terms,—"ordained and established,"—and that of "compact," on which the whole argument rests; although it would be no difficult task to show that it is a gratuitous assumption, without any foundation whatever for its support. It is sufficient for my purpose, to show, that the assumption is wholly inconsistent with the constitution itself;—as much so, as the conclusion drawn from it has been shown to be inconsistent with the opinion of the convention which formed it. Very little will be required, after what has been already stated, to establish what I propose.

That the constitution regards itself in the light of a compact, still existing between the States, after it was ordained and established; that it regards the union, then existing, as still existing; and the several States, of course, still members of it, in their original character of confederated States, is clear. Its seventh article, so often referred to, in connection with the arguments drawn from the preamble, sufficiently establishes all these points, without adducing others; except that which relates to the continuance of the union. To establish this, it will not be necessary to travel out of the preamble and the letter of the convention, laying the plan of the constitution before the Congress of the confederation. In enumerating the objects for which the constitution was ordained and established, the preamble places at the head of the rest, as its leading object,—"to form a more perfect union." So far, then, are the terms,—"ordained and established," from being incompatible with the union, or having the effect of destroying it, the constitution itself declares that it was intended, "to form a more perfect union." This, of itself, is sufficient to refute the assertion of their incompatibility. But it is proper here to remark, that it could not have been intended, by the expression in the preamble,—"to form a more perfect union,"—to declare, that the

old was abolished, and a new and more perfect union established in its place: for we have the authority of the convention which formed the constitution, to prove that their object was to continue the then existing union. In their letter, laying it before Congress, they say,—"In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our view, that which appears to us, the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our union." "Our union," can refer to no other than the then existing union,—the old union of the confederacy, and of the revolutionary government which preceded it,—of which these States were confederated members. This must, of course, have been the union to which the framers referred in the preamble. It was this, accordingly, which the constitution intended to make more perfect; just as the confederacy made more perfect, that of the revolutionary government. Nor is there any thing in the term, "consolidation," used by the convention, calculated to weaken the conclusion. It is a strong expression; but as strong as it is, it certainly was not intended to imply the destruction of the union, as it is supposed to do by the advocates of a national government; for that would have been incompatible with the context, as well as with the continuance of the union,—which the sentence and the entire letter imply. Interpreted, then, in conjunction with the expression used in the preamble,—"to form a more perfect union,"—although it may more strongly intimate closeness of connection; it can imply nothing incompatible with the professed object of perfecting the union,—still less a meaning and effect wholly inconsistent with the nature of a confederated community. For to adopt the interpretation contended for, to its full extent, would be to *destroy* the union, and not to consolidate and perfect it.

If we turn from the preamble and the ratifications, to the body of the constitution, we shall find that it furnishes most conclusive proof that the government is federal, and not national. I can discover nothing, in any portion of it, which gives the least countenance to the opposite conclusion. On the contrary, the instrument, in all its parts, repels it. It is, throughout, federal. It everywhere recognizes the existence of the States, and invokes their aid to carry its powers into execution. In one of the two houses of Congress, the members are elected by the legislatures of their respective States; and in the other, by the people of the several States, not as

composing mere districts of one great community, but as distinct and independent communities. General Washington vetoed the first act apportioning the members of the House of Representatives among the several States, under the first census, expressly on the ground, that the act assumed as its basis, the former, and not the latter construction. The President and Vice-President are chosen by electors, appointed by their respective States; and, finally, the Judges are appointed by the President and the Senate; and, of course, as these are elected by the States, they are appointed through their agency.

But, however strong be the proofs of its federal character derived from this source, that portion which provides for the amendment of the constitution, furnishes, if possible, still stronger. It shows, conclusively, that the people of the several States still retain that supreme ultimate power, called sovereignty; — the power by which they ordained and established the constitution; and which can rightfully create, modify, amend, or abolish it, at its pleasure. Wherever this power resides, there the sovereignty is to be found. That it still continues to exist in the several States, in a modified form, is clearly shown by the fifth article of the constitution, which provides for its amendment. By its provisions, Congress may propose amendments, on its own authority, by the vote of two-thirds of both houses; or it may be compelled to call a convention to propose them, by two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States: but, in either case, they remain, when thus made, mere proposals of no validity, until adopted by three-fourths of the States, through their respective legislatures; or by conventions, called by them, for the purpose. Thus far, the several States, in ordaining and establishing the constitution, agreed, for their mutual convenience and advantage, to modify, by compact, their high sovereign power of creating and establishing constitutions, as far as it related to the constitution and government of the United States. I say, for their mutual convenience and advantage; for without the modification, it would have required the separate consent of all the States of the Union to alter or amend their constitutional compact; in like manner as it required the consent of all to establish it between them; and to obviate the almost insuperable difficulty of making such amendments as time and experience might prove to be necessary, by the unanimous consent of all, they agreed to make the modification. But that they did not intend, by this,

to divest themselves of the high sovereign right, (a right which they still retain, notwithstanding the modification,) to change or abolish the present constitution and government at their pleasure, cannot be doubted. It is an acknowledged principle, that sovereigns may, by compact, modify or qualify the exercise of their power, without impairing their sovereignty; of which, the confederacy existing at the time, furnishes a striking illustration. It must reside, unimpaired and in its plentitude, somewhere. And if it do not reside in the people of the several States, in their confederated character, where,— so far as it relates to the constitution and government of the United States,— can it be found? Not, certainly, in the government; for, according to our theory, sovereignty resides in the people, and not in the government. That it cannot be found in the people, taken in the aggregate, as forming one community or nation, is equally certain. But as certain as it cannot, just so certain is it, that it must reside in the people of the several States: and if it reside in them at all, it must reside in them as separate and distinct communities; for it has been shown, that it does not reside in them in the aggregate, as forming one community or nation. These are the only aspects under which it is possible to regard the people; and, just as certain as it resides in them, in that character, so certain is it that ours is a federal, and not a national government.

WEBSTER'S TRIBUTE TO CALHOUN.

Speech in the Senate, April 1, 1850, *the Day after Mr. Calhoun's Death.*

I hope the Senate will indulge me in adding a very few words to what has been said. My apology for this presumption is the very long acquaintance which has subsisted between Mr. Calhoun and myself. We are of the same age. I made my first entrance into the House of Representatives in May, 1813, and there found Mr. Calhoun. He had already been in that body for two or three years. I found him then an active and efficient member of the assembly to which he belonged, taking a decided part, and exercising a decided influence, in all its deliberations.

From that day to the day of his death, amidst all the strifes of party and politics, there has subsisted between us, always, and without interruption, a great degree of personal kindness.

Differing widely on many great questions respecting the institutions and government of the country, those differences never interrupted our personal and social intercourse. I have been present at most of the distinguished instances of the exhibition of his talents in debate. I have always heard him with pleasure, often with much instruction, not unfrequently with the highest degree of admiration.

Mr. Calhoun was calculated to be a leader in whatsoever association of political friends he was thrown. He was a man of undoubted genius and of commanding talent. All the country and the world admit that.

His mind was both perceptive and vigorous. It was clear, quick, and strong.

Sir, the eloquence of Mr. Calhoun or the manner of his exhibition of his sentiments in public bodies was part of his intellectual character. It grew out of the qualities of his mind. It was plain, strong, terse, condensed, concise; sometimes impassioned, still always severe. Rejecting ornament, not often seeking far for illustration, his power consisted in the plainness of his propositions, in the closeness of his logic, and in the earnestness and energy of his manner. These are the qualities, as I think, which have enabled him, through such a long course of years, to speak often, and yet always command attention. His demeanor as a Senator is known to us all — is appreciated, venerated by us all. No man was more respectful to others; no man carried himself with greater decorum, no man with superior dignity. I think there is not one of us but felt, when he last addressed us from his seat in the Senate, his form still erect, with a voice by no means indicating such a degree of physical weakness as did, in fact, possess him, with clear tones, and an impressive, and, I may say, an imposing manner, who did not feel that he might imagine that we saw before us a Senator of Rome, when Rome survived.

Sir, I have not in public nor in private life known a more assiduous person in the discharge of his appropriate duties. I have known no man who wasted less of life in what is called recreation or employed less of it in any pursuits not connected with the immediate discharge of his duty. He seemed to have no recreation but the pleasure of conversation with his friends.

Out of the chambers of Congress, he was either devoting himself to the acquisition of knowledge pertaining to the immediate subject of the duty before him or else he was indulging in those social interviews in which he so much delighted.

My honorable friend from Kentucky has spoken in just terms of his colloquial talents. They certainly were singular and eminent. There was a charm in his conversation not often found. He delighted especially in conversation and intercourse with young men. I suppose that there has been no man among us who had more winning manners, in such an intercourse and conversation with men comparatively young, than Mr. Calhoun. I believe one great power of his character, in general, was his conversational talent. I believe it is that, as well as a consciousness of his high integrity, and the greatest reverence for his intellect and ability, that has made him so endeared an object to the people of the State to which he belonged.

Mr. President, he had the basis, the indispensable basis, of all high character; and that was unspotted integrity — unimpeached honor and character. If he had aspirations, they were high, honorable, and noble. There was nothing groveling or low or meanly selfish that came near the head or the heart of Mr. Calhoun. Firm in his purpose, perfectly patriotic and honest, as I am sure he was, in the principles that he espoused, and in the measures that he defended, aside from that large regard for that species of distinction that conducted him to eminent stations for the benefit of the republic, I do not believe he had a selfish motive or selfish feeling.

However, sir, he may have differed from others of us in his political opinions or his political principles, those principles and those opinions will now descend to posterity under the sanction of a great name. He has lived long enough, he has done enough, and he has done it so well, so successfully, so honorably, as to connect himself for all time with the records of his country. He is now an historical character. Those of us who have known him here will find that he has left upon our minds and our hearts a strong and lasting impression of his person, his character, and his public performances, which, while we live, will never be obliterated. We shall, hereafter, I am sure, indulge in it as a grateful recollection that we have lived in his age, that we have been his contemporaries, that we have seen him and heard him and known him. We shall

delight to speak of him to those who are rising up to fill our places. And, when the time shall come when we ourselves shall go, one after another, in succession to our graves, we shall carry with us a deep sense of his genius and character, his honor and integrity, his amiable deportment in private life, and the purity of his exalted patriotism.

VON HOLST ON CALHOUN.

From his Life of Calhoun.

Life is not only "stranger than fiction," but frequently also more tragical than any tragedy ever conceived by the most fervid imagination. Often in these tragedies of life there is not one drop of blood to make us shudder, nor a single event to compel the tears into the eye. A man endowed with an intellect far above the average, impelled by a high-soaring ambition, untainted by any petty or ignoble passion, and guided by a character of sterling firmness and more than common purity, yet, with fatal illusion, devoting all his mental powers, all his moral energy, and the whole force of his iron will to the service of a doomed and unholy cause, and at last sinking into the grave in the very moment when, under the weight of the top-stone, the towering pillars of the temple of his impure idol are rent to their very base,— can anything more tragical be conceived? . . .

It was his solemn conviction that throughout his life he had faithfully done his duty, both to the Union and to his section, because, as he honestly believed slavery to be "a good, a positive good," he had never been able to see that it was impossible to serve at the same time the Union and his section, if his section was considered as identical with the slavocracy. In perfect good faith he had undertaken what no man could accomplish, because it was a physical and moral impossibility: antagonistic principles cannot be united into a basis on which to rest a huge political fabric. Nullification and the government of law; State supremacy and a constitutional Union, endowed with the power necessary to minister to the wants of a great people; the nationalization of slavery upon the basis of States-rightism in a federal Union, composed principally of free communities, by which slavery was considered a sin and

a curse; equality of States and constitutional consolidation of geographical sections, with an artificial preponderance granted to the minority,— these were incompatibilities, and no logical ingenuity could reason them together into the formative principle of a gigantic commonwealth. The speculations of the keenest political logician the United States had ever had ended in the greatest logical monstrosity imaginable, because his reasoning started from a *contradictio in adjecto*. This he failed to see, because the mad delusion had wholly taken possession of his mind that in this age of steam and electricity, of democratic ideas and the rights of man, slavery was "the most solid foundation of liberty." More than to any other man, the South owed it to him that she succeeded for such a long time in forcing the most democratic and the most progressive commonwealth of the universe to bend its knees and do homage to the idol of this "peculiar institution"; but therefore also the largest share of the responsibility for what at last did come rests on his shoulders.

No man can write the last chapter of his own biography, in which the *Facit* of his whole life is summed up, so to say, in one word. If ever a new edition of the works of the greatest and purest of pro-slavery fanatics should be published, it ought to have a short appendix,— the Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln.

John C. Calhoun (1782–1850) was the pre-eminent representative of the doctrine of State Rights, as Daniel Webster was the pre-eminent representative of the doctrine of National Sovereignty, in the great controversy which raged in the country uninterruptedly in various forms from the time of the Constitutional Convention until its final settlement by the logic of events in the Civil War. "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable," was the great watchword of Webster. It was this emblazoned on our ensign which he wished might greet his last earthly vision. "If you should ask me," Calhoun once said, "the word that I would wish engraven on my tombstone, it is *Nullification*." It was in the debate between Webster and Calhoun in February, 1833, immediately after the passage of the nullification act by South Carolina,—an act declaring the national tariff act of 1832 null and void and forbidding the collection of duties at any port in the State, threatening secession if interfered with,— and in the famous debate between Webster and Senator Hayne, of South Carolina, three years before, while South Carolina was threatening nullification and while Calhoun was Vice-President of the United States and president of the Senate, that the two opposing principles received their most powerful presentation upon the floor of Congress. The student should read (Calhoun's Works, vol. i.) Calhoun's speech on the Revenue Collection (Force) Bill, February 15–16, 1833, and his speech on his Resolutions in support of State Rights, February 26, 1833. The first of these famous resolutions was, "That the people of the several States comprising these United States are united as parties to a constitutional compact, to which the people of each State acceded as a separate and sovereign community, each binding itself by its own particular ratification; and that the union, of which the said compact is the bond, is a union between the States ratifying the same." The student should also read the various addresses prepared by Calhoun for the legislature and people of South Carolina during the nullification period, 1828–32, setting forth their theory of their relation to the general government (Calhoun's Works, vol. vi.).

But perhaps nowhere else did Calhoun expound his views so systematically as in his "Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States," whose introductory sections are reprinted in the present leaflet. This was the second of two important essays in political philosophy written in 1849, but not published until after his death. The first of the two essays was a general "Disquisition on Government"; and of this posthumous work John Stuart Mill spoke as that of one who had "displayed powers as a speculative political thinker superior to any who has appeared in American politics since the authors of 'The Federalist.'" These essays occupy together the whole of the first volume of Calhoun's Works.

It must not be supposed that the theory that the United States is a confederacy was exclusively a Southern theory, and the theory of a nation a Northern one. Both theories have been operative in both sections. See Powell's "Nullification and Secession in the United States." Hayne's great speech upon State Rights should always be read in connection with Webster's famous reply to it, especially for its historical survey of the attitude of New England and the North in 1815 and preceding years. A still more powerful presentation of this — one of the greatest of all American political papers — is the address of John Quincy Adams, first published by Henry Adams in his "Documents relating to New England Federalism." The strong national theory and sentiment upon which our government now rests have been a gradual development; and Webster's great speeches were even more important for the history which they made than for that which they expounded.

The most scholarly and critical life of Calhoun is that in the American Statesmen Series, by Von Holst, whose Constitutional History of the United States is also largely devoted to the study of the long struggle with the State Rights doctrine, of which Calhoun was the great champion. There is an earlier biography by John S. Jenkins, in which several of Calhoun's most significant and representative speeches are incorporated: and this will be of use to those who do not have access to the edition (in 6 vols.) of Calhoun's Works. The long article on Calhoun in the Cyclopædia of American Biography was written by J. Randolph Tucker, and is of unusual value. The lives of Webster and his replies to Calhoun and Hayne should be consulted. The bibliography for the whole period of Calhoun's public life in Channing and Hart's "Guide to American History" is very complete and well arranged. See especially the sections on "Theories of the Constitution," "Tariff and Nullification, 1828–32," and "Public Controversy as to Slavery."

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

140

Old South Leaflets.

No. 107.

Lincoln's Cooper Institute Address.

Address at Cooper Institute, New York, Feb. 27, 1860.

Mr. President and Fellow-citizens of New York: — The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation. In his speech last autumn at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in the "New-York Times," Senator Douglas said:

> Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now.

I fully indorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting-point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of the Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry: What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned?

What is the frame of government under which we live? The answer must be, "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787, and under which the present government first went into operation, and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may

be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time. Their names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers understood "just as well, and even better, than we do now"?

It is this: Does the proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our Federal Government to control as to slavery in our Federal Territories?

Upon this, Senator Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmation and denial form an issue; and this issue — this question — is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood "better than we." Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine," or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it — how they expressed that better understanding. In 1784, three years before the Constitution, the United States then owning the Northwestern Territory and no other, the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition, thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory. The other of the four, James McHenry, voted against the prohibition, showing that for some cause he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern Territory still was the only Territory owned by the United States, the same question of prohibiting slavery in the Territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and two more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on the question.

They were William Blount and William Few; and they both voted for the prohibition — thus showing that in their understanding no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being part of what is now well known as the ordinance of '87.

The question of Federal control of slavery in the Territories seems not to have been directly before the convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine," or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine" — Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without ayes and nays, which is equivalent to a unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman, Wm. S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, Thos. Fitzsimmons, William Few, Abraham Baldwin, Rufus King, William Paterson, George Clymer, Richard Bassett, George Read, Pierce Butler, Daniel Carroll, and James Madison.

This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit slavery in the Federal territory; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and as such approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal Government the

country now constituting the State of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabama. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not prohibit slavery in the ceded country. Besides this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it — take control of it — even there, to a certain extent. In 1798 Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory from any place without the United States, by fine, and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without yeas and nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Read, and Abraham Baldwin. They all probably voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

In 1803 the Federal Government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own States; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804 Congress gave a territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial Act, prohibit slavery; but they did interfere with it — take control of it — in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made in relation to slaves was:

1st. That no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign parts.

2d. That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

3d. That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the

cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act also was passed without ayes or nays. In the Congress which passed it there were two of the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it if, in their understanding, it violated either the line properly dividing local from Federal authority, or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819-20 came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine" — Rufus King and Charles Pinckney — were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition and against all compromises. By this, Mr. King showed that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in Federal territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed that, in his understanding, there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted as being four in 1784, two in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819-20, there would be thirty of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read each twice, and Abraham Baldwin three times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three out of our thirty-nine fathers "who framed the government under which we live," who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better, than we do now"; and twenty-one of them — a clear majority of the whole "thirty-

nine"— so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety and wilful perjury if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against congressional prohibition of slavery in the Federal Territories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of Federal control of slavery in the Federal Territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any person, however distinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers, who framed the original Constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even on any other phase of the general question of slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those

other phases, as the foreign slave-trade, and the morality and policy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of Federal control of slavery in Federal Territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted anti-slavery men of those times, — as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and Gouverneur Morris, — while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The sum of the whole is that of our thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one — a clear majority of the whole — certainly understood that no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories; while all the rest had probably the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution; and the text affirms that they understood the question "better than we."

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In and by the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of "the government under which we live" consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that Federal control of slavery in Federal Territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that no person shall be deprived of "life, liberty, or property without due process of law"; while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amendment, providing that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution" "are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now, it so happens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution — the identical Congress which passed the act, already mentioned,

enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these constitutional amendments, and this act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The constitutional amendments were introduced before, and passed after, the act enforcing the ordinance of '87; so that, during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the ordinance, the constitutional amendments were also pending.

The seventy-six members of that Congress, including sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were pre-eminently our fathers who framed that part of "the government under which we live" which is now claimed as forbidding the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories.

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the same mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent, understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we — better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the thirty-nine framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." And so assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever, in his whole life, declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. I go a step further. I defy any one to show that any living man in the whole world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century), declare that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to

control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. To those who now so declare I give not only "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience — to reject all progress, all improvement. What I do say is that, if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man at this day sincerely believes that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, who have less access to history, and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" were of the same opinion — thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerely believes "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough! Let all who believe that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Re-

publicans ask — all Republicans desire — in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it be not grudgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen,— as I suppose they will not,— I would address a few words to the Southern people.

I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still, when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable prerequisite — license, so to speak — among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now can you or not be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves? Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section — gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we

do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours; but this brings you to where you ought to have started — to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet us as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? No! Then you really believe that the principle which "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and indorse it again and again, upon their official oaths, is in fact so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Congress enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which act embodied the policy of the government upon that subject up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it, he wrote Lafayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should at some time have a confederacy of free States.

Bearing this in mind, and seeing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you, who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative — eminently conservative — while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by "our fathers who framed the government under which we live"; while you with one accord reject,

and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You are divided on new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave-trade; some for a congressional slave code for the Territories; some for Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit slavery within their limits; some for maintaining slavery in the Territories through the judiciary; some for the "gur-reat pur-rinciple" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "popular sovereignty"; but never a man among you is in favor of Federal prohibition of slavery in Federal Territories, according to the practice of "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our government originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, readopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it, or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable for not designating the man and proving the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable for asserting it, and especially for persisting in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair, but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold no doctrine, and make no declaration, which were not held to and made by "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," declare our belief that slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood, and thunder among the slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which at least three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was "got up by Black Republicanism." In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general, or even a very extensive, slave insurrection is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary freemen, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels; but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule; and the slave revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, "It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably, and in such slow degrees, as that the evil will wear off insensibly; and their places be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slaveholding States only. The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution — the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He vent-

ures the attempt, which ends in little else than his own execution. Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon and John Brown's attempt at Harper's Ferry were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on old England in the one case and on New England in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's Book, and the like, break up the Republican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling — that sentiment — by breaking up the political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire; but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot-box into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

But you will break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of your constitutional rights.

That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be palliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right plainly written down in the Constitution. But we are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations, you have a specific and well-understood allusion to an assumed constitutional right of yours to take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in the Constitution. That instrument is literally silent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is that you will destroy the government, unless you be allowed to construe and force the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed constitutional

question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the lawyer's distinction between dictum and decision, the court has decided the question for you in a sort of way. The court has substantially said, it is your constitutional right to take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property. When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided court, by a bare majority of the judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning, and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact — the statement in the opinion that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution."

An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not "distinctly and expressly affirmed" in it. Bear in mind, the judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is "distinctly and expressly" affirmed there — "distinctly," that is, not mingled with anything else — "expressly," that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or slavery; and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person"; and wherever his master's legal right in relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor which may be due" — as a debt payable in service or labor. Also it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.

To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers who

framed the government under which we live" — the men who made the Constitution — decided this same constitutional question in our favor long ago: decided it without division among themselves when making the decision; without division among themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and, so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this government unless such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action? But you will not abide the election of a Republican president! In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us! That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me — my money — was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them.

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know, because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, What will satisfy them? Simply this: we must not only let them alone, but we must somehow convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly — done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated — we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Senator Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone; do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone, — have never disturbed them, — so that, after all, it is what we say which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not as yet in terms demanded the overthrow of our free-State constitutions. Yet those constitutions declare the wrong of slavery with more solemn emphasis than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it as a legal right and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this on any ground save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it are themselves wrong, and should be silenced and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality — its universality; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension — its enlargement. All they ask we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right and our thinking it wrong is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national Territories, and to overrun us here in these free States? If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored — contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man; such as a policy of "don't care" on a question about which all true men do care; such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous, to repentance; such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

Lincoln's address at the Cooper Institute, New York, on the evening of February 27, 1860, was, perhaps, the most important single speech which he made before his presidency and the most systematic and powerful statement which he ever made of the case against slavery and its defenders. The occasion itself was noteworthy. Lincoln's debate with Douglas in 1858 had given him a national reputation, and the anti-slavery men of the East were curious and anxious to see and hear him. Nicolay and Hay, in their Life of Lincoln, devote an entire chapter (vol. ii., chap. xii.) to this great speech and the circumstances of its delivery. "Since the days of Clay and Webster," said the *Tribune* the next morning, "no man has spoken to a larger assemblage of the intellect and mental culture of our city." William Cullen Bryant presided, and the leading Republicans of New York sat upon the platform. "The representative men of New York," wrote the biographers, "were naturally eager to see and hear one who, by whatever force of eloquence or argument, had attracted so large a share of the public attention. We may also fairly infer that, on his part, Lincoln was no less curious to test the effect of his words on an audience more learned and critical than those collected in the open-air meetings of his Western campaigns. This mutual interest was an evident advantage to both: it secured a close attention from the house and insured deliberation and emphasis by the speaker, enabling him to develop his argument with perfect precision and unity, reaching, perhaps, the happiest general effect ever attained in any one of his long addresses. . . . If any part of the audience came with the expectation of hearing the rhetorical fireworks of a Western stump-speaker of the 'half-horse, half-alligator' variety, they met novelty of an unlooked-for kind. In Lincoln's entire address he neither introduced an anecdote nor essayed a witticism; and the first half of it does not contain even an illustrative figure or a poetical fancy. It was the quiet, searching exposition of the historian and the terse, compact reasoning of the statesman about an abstract principle of legislation, in language well-nigh as restrained and colorless as he would have employed in arguing a case before a court. Yet such was the apt choice of words, the easy precision of sentences, the simple strength of propositions, the fairness of every point he assumed, and the force of every conclusion he drew, that his listeners followed him with the interest and delight a child feels in its easy mastery of a plain sum in arithmetic."

The next morning the four leading New York newspapers printed the address in full. "Mr. Lincoln is one of nature's orators," said the *Tribune*, "using his rare powers solely to elucidate and convince, though their inevitable effect is to delight and electrify as well. We present herewith a very full and accurate report of this speech: yet the tones, the gestures, the kindling eye, and the mirth-provoking look defy the reporter's skill. The vast assemblage frequently rang with cheers and shouts of applause, which were prolonged and intensified at the close. No man ever before made such an impression on his first appeal to a New York audience." A pamphlet reprint was at once announced by the *Tribune*, and later a more careful edition was prepared and circulated.

From New York Lincoln went to speak at several places in New England, everywhere making a deep impression; and this Eastern visit did much to bring him into prominence as a candidate for the presidency. See Herndon's Life of Lincoln for an account of the great care which he gave to the preparation of the Cooper Institute speech, and its important influence on his own fortunes.

Lincoln's Complete Works, comprising his speeches, letters, state papers, and miscellaneous writings, edited by Nicolay and Hay, are published in two volumes. There have already been published in the series of Old South Leaflets Lincoln's Inaugurals (No. 11) and the First Lincoln and Douglas Debate (No. 85).

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

160

Old South Leaflets.

No. 108.

The Invention of the Steamboat.

An Historical Account of the Application of Steam for the Propelling of Boats: a letter from Chancellor Livingston to the editors of the "American Medical and Philosophical Register," published in that journal in January, 1812 (vol. ii. p. 256).

It is much to be wished that a regular account of the introduction of useful arts had been transmitted by the historical writers of every age and country, not merely that justice might be done to the genius and enterprise of the inventors, and the nation by whom they were fostered, but that the statesman and philosopher might mark the influence of each upon the wealth, morals, and characters of mankind. Every one sees and acknowledges the changes that have been wrought by the improvements in agriculture and navigation, but seldom reflects on the extent to which apparently small discoveries have influenced not only the prosperity of the nation to which the invention owes its birth, but those with which it is remotely connected. When Arkwright invented his cotton-mills, the man would have been laughed at that ventured to predict that not only Great Britain would be many millions gainer annually by it, but that in consequence of it the waste lands of the Carolinas and Georgia would attain an incalculable value, and their planters vie in wealth with the nabobs of the East. A new art has sprung up among us, which promises to be attended with such important consequences that I doubt not, sirs, you will with pleasure make your useful work record its introduction: that when in future years it becomes common, the names

of the inventors may not be lost to posterity, and that its effects upon the wealth and manners of society may be more accurately marked. I refer (as you have doubtless conjectured) to the invention of steamboats, which owe their introduction solely to the genius and enterprise of our fellow-citizens; the utility of which is already so far acknowledged that, although only four years have elapsed since the first boat was built by Mr. Livingston and Mr. Fulton, ten vessels are now in operation on their construction, and several more contracted for.

When Messrs. Watt and Bolton had given a great degree of perfection to the steam-engine, it was conceived that this great and manageable power might be usefully applied to the purposes of navigation; the first attempt, however, to effect this, as far as I have yet learned, was made in America in the year 1783. Mr. John Fitch (having first obtained from most of the States in the Union a law vesting in him for a long term the exclusive use of steamboats) built one upon the Delaware. He made use of Watt and Bolton's engine, and his propelling power was paddles. This vessel navigated the river from Philadelphia to Bordentown for a few weeks, but was found so imperfect, and liable to so many accidents, that it was laid aside, after the projector had expended a large sum of money for himself and his associates.

Rumsey, another American, who was deservedly ranked among our most ingenious mechanics, followed Fitch; but, not being able to find men at home who were willing, after Fitch's failure, to embark in so hazardous an enterprise, he went to England, where, aided by the capital of Mr. Daniel Parker and other moneyed men, he built a boat upon the Thames, which, after many and very expensive trials, was found defective, and never went into operation. Rumsey's propelling power was water pumped by the engine into the vessel and expelled from the stern.

The next attempt was made by Chancellor Livingston, to whom, as to Fitch, the State of New York gave an exclusive right for twenty years, upon condition that he built and kept in operation a boat of twenty tons burthen, that should go at the rate of four miles an hour. He expended a considerable sum of money in the experiment, and built a boat of about thirty tons burthen, which went three miles an hour. As this did not fulfil the conditions of his contract with the State, he

relinquished the project for the moment, resolving, whenever his public avocations would give him leisure, to pursue it. His action upon the water was by a horizontal wheel placed in a well in the bottom of the boat, which communicated with the water at its centre; and when whirled rapidly round propelled the water by the centrifugal force through an aperture in the stern. In this way he hoped to escape the encumbrance of external wheels or paddles, and the irregularities that the action of the waves might occasion. Not being able with the small engine he used, which was an eighteen-inch cylinder, with a three-feet stroke, to obtain, as I have said, a greater velocity than three miles an hour, and fearing that the loss of power in this way was greater than could be compensated by the advantage he proposed from his plan, he relinquished it; but, as I am informed, still thinks that when boats are designed for very rough water it may be eligible to adopt it in preference to external wheels.

Not long after, John Stevens, Esq., of Hoboken, engaged in the same pursuit, tried elliptical paddles, smoke-jack wheels, and a variety of other ingenious contrivances,— sometimes of his own invention, and again in conjunction with Mr. Kinsley, late one of our most distinguished mechanicians. None of these having been attended with the desired effect, Mr. Stevens has, since the introduction of Messrs. Livingston and Fulton's boat, adopted their principles, and built two boats that are propelled by wheels, to which he has added a boiler of his invention, that promises to be a useful improvement on engines designed for boats. Whilst these unsuccessful attempts were making in America, the mechanics of Europe were not wholly inattentive to the object. Lord Stanhope, who deservedly ranks very high among them, expended a considerable sum of money in building a steamboat, which, like all that preceded it, totally failed. His operating power upon the water was something in the form of a duck's foot. A gentleman in France (whose name I have forgotten), when Mr. Livingston and Mr. Fulton were building their experimental boat on the Seine, complained in the French papers that the Americans had forestalled his invention; that he had invented a boat that would go seven miles an hour, and explained his principles. Mr. Fulton replied to him, and showed him that attempts had been previously made in America, and assuring him that his plan was quite different. Mr. —— would not

answer. He had expended a great deal of money and failed; he made use of a horizontal cylinder and chain-paddles.

After the experiments made by Mr. Livingston and Mr. Fulton at Paris, a boat was built in Scotland that moved in some measure like a small boat that was exhibited for some time at New York by Mr. Fitch. The cylinder was laid horizontally, and her action upon the water was similar to his; but, as her speed upon the water was a little better than two miles an hour, I presume she has gone into disuse.

You will not, sir, find this record of the errors of projectors uninteresting, since they serve the double purpose of deterring others from wasting time and money upon them, and of setting in its true light the enterprise of those who, regardless of so many failures, had the boldness to undertake and the happiness to succeed in the enterprise.

Robert R. Livingston, Esq., when minister in France, met with Mr. Fulton, and they formed that friendship and connection with each other to which a similarity of pursuits generally gives birth. He communicated to Mr. Fulton the importance of steamboats to their common country, informed him of what had been attempted in America and of his resolution to resume the pursuit on his return, and advised him to turn his attention to the subject. It was agreed between them to embark in the enterprise, and immediately to make such experiments as would enable them to determine how far, in spite of former failures, the object was attainable. The principal direction of these experiments was left to Mr. Fulton, who united, in a very considerable degree, practical to a theoretical knowledge of mechanics. After trying a variety of experiments on a small scale, on models of his own invention, it was understood that he had developed the true principles upon which steamboats should be built, and for the want of knowing which all previous experiments had failed. But, as these gentlemen both knew that many things which were apparently perfect when tried on a small scale failed when reduced to practice upon a large one, they determined to go to the expense of building an operating boat upon the Seine. This was done in the year 1803, at their joint expense, under the direction of Mr. Fulton, and so fully evinced the justice of his principles that it was immediately determined to enrich their country by the valuable discovery as soon as they should meet there, and in the mean time to order an engine to be made in England. On the ar-

rival at New York of Mr. Fulton, which was not until 1806, they immediately engaged in building a boat of what was then considered very considerable dimensions. This boat began to navigate the Hudson River in September, 1807; its progress through the water was at the rate of five miles an hour. In the course of the ensuing winter it was enlarged to a boat of one hundred and forty feet keel, and sixteen and a half feet beam. The legislature of the State were so fully convinced of the great utility of the invention, and the interest the State had in its encouragement, that they made a new contract with Mr. Livingston and Mr. Fulton, by which they extended the term of their exclusive right five years for every additional boat they should build, provided that the whole term should not exceed thirty years, in consequence of which they have added two boats to the North River boat (besides those that have been built by others under their license), the Car of Neptune, which is a beautiful vessel of about three hundred tons burthen, and the Paragon, of three hundred and fifty tons, a drawing of which is sent you herewith, together with a description of her interior arrangements.

It will appear, sir, from the above history of steamboats, that the first development of the principles and combinations upon which their success was founded was discovered by Mr. Fulton in the year 1803, and grew out of a variety of experiments made by him and Mr. Livingston for that purpose, at Paris, about that period; and that the first steamboat that was ever in this or any other country put into useful operation (if we except the imperfect trial of Fitch) was built upon those principles by Mr. Livingston and Mr. Fulton, at New York, in 1807. From these periods the invention of the art may be dated. I will not trouble you with an explanation of these principles; they are now so clearly developed in his patents, and rendered so obvious by being publicly reduced to practice, that any experienced mechanic may, by a recourse to them, build a steamboat. What has hitherto been a stumbling-block to the ablest mechanicians of the old and new world is now become so obvious and familiar to all that they look back with astonishment upon their own failures, and lament the time they have been deprived of this useful invention. Had it not been for a fortunate occurrence of circumstances, it is highly probable that another century would have elapsed before it had been introduced. Past failures operated as a discouragement

to new trials; the great expense that attended experiments upon the only scale on which it could succeed would have deterred any but men of property from engaging in the enterprise; and how few of these are there in any country that choose to risk much in projects, and upon such especially as have repeatedly proved unfortunate? Add to this that without special encouragement from the government, and a perfect security of their rights, in case of the success of so expensive and hazardous an enterprise, it could not have been expected that any individuals would have embarked their time, their fame, and their fortunes in it. In the present instance, happily for our country, mechanical talents and property united with the enthusiasm of projectors in the enterprise, and the enlightened policy of this State afforded it a liberal patronage. Under these circumstances a new art has happily, and honorably for this country, been brought into existence. Speed, convenience, and ease have been introduced into our system of travelling, which the world has never before experienced, and the projectors, stimulated by the public patronage and the pride of success, have spared no expense that can contribute to the ease and safety of travellers. Their boats are furnished with every accommodation that can be found in the best hotels. Every new boat is an improvement upon the one that preceded, until they have obtained a degree of perfection which leaves us nothing to wish but that the public, duly impressed with the advantage they have received from their labors, may cheerfully bestow on them the honor and profit to which the boldness of their enterprise and the liberal manner in which it has been executed so justly entitle them.

A Friend to Science.

ROBERT FULTON TO AARON OGDEN (1814) ON THE INVENTION OF THE STEAMBOAT.

Sir,— Studiously occupied on a new invention which presents a prospect of great national utility, and relying on the dignified integrity of a legislature distinguished for the patronage and patriotism it gives to useful improvements, I have not attended at Albany to guard from your address and industry the rights granted to Livingston and Fulton, and which I hope every upright and liberal mind will acknowledge they have faithfully and honorably earned.

But by letters received from Albany I am informed that in your address to the committee, among other things attempting to prove that I am not the inventor of steamboats, you exhibited Charnock's work on naval architecture to show that I have quoted him in my patent; and thereby you endeavored to make an impression that I had patented the experiments on the resistance of bodies moving through water *as my own*. If, sir, you have done so before the honorable committee, and they and the audience know it, then you have done it knowing it to be *false:* for you made a like attempt before a committee at Trenton in February last, at which time I presented to you and the committee the drawing from my patent and quotations from said work, at the bottom of which I gave the author credit for the information I received in the following words: "This table of the resistance of bodies moved through water is taken from experiments made in England by a society for the encouragement of naval architecture between the years 1793 and 1798." This fact you knew at Trenton, and there acknowledged that I had not attempted to patent the experiments of others, but only used them as a means for demonstrating principles. Hence, if at Albany you have impressed the committee with a belief that I could be so base as to pirate the labors of others, and present them to my liberal countrymen as my own, you have done an unjust and ungenerous deed, which would make the cheek of rigid honor blush. I say, if you have done so.— for I place it on the conjunction *if*.— you have departed from that noble candor, that respect for truth, which marks the moral man and man of honor; and you have attempted to destroy my character for honesty by depicting me as guilty of perjury, for in obtaining my patent I swore that I believed myself the original discoverer and inventor of the thing patented. To a man who loves his country, and whose greatest pleasure is to merit the esteem of his countrymen, this is too serious a charge to remain without refutation.

That a patent may be taken according to law, it must be so explained that a person skilled in an art which most resembles it could, from the specification, drawings, or models, make the machine. Therefore I drew from those tables such conclusions as, in my opinion, would show to other persons how the calculations should be made to ascertain as near as possible the resistance of any given boat while running from one to six

or more miles an hour, and from her resistance also show what should be the power of the steam-engine to drive her the required velocity, then show what should be the size of the wheel-boards, which take the purchase on the water, and their speed compared to the speed of the boat, all of which were necessary to be ascertained, selected, and combined before any one could originate a useful steamboat; and it was for want of such selection and just combination of first principles, founded on the laws of nature, that every attempt at constructing useful steamboats *previous to mine failed.* But, now that they are discovered and carried into practice on the great scale, you and Mr. Dodd can copy them, and have copied them exact. This is proved by the affidavits of many experienced and respectable engineers, and will be acknowledged by every one who has the least information on mechanical combinations; yet neither you nor Mr. Dodd, possessed as you are of Charnock's book, now know the principles which originated and govern the construction of steamboats, nor can you find them in that book or any other.

But, as you have looked much into books, models, and abortive experiments to prove steamboats an old invention, can you show any publication, model, or work that distinctly points out what the power of the engine must be to drive the boat the required velocity? or any work that distinctly shows the best mode for taking the purchase on the water, whether by oars, paddles, shulls, endless chains, ducks' feet, valves, or wheels? or what should be the size of the paddle-boards and their velocity? No, sir, *you cannot.* These indispensable first principles are nowhere to be found except in my patent. They are the discovery, the invention, which caused success. Previous to my experiments all was doubt and conjecture. No one could tell the requisite power of the engine, no one had determined the best mode for taking the purchase on the water or the powers and velocities of the component parts. If they had, why did you not avail yourself of them, and construct a useful steamboat ten years ago? If those proportions and powers, which are now demonstrated by actual practice in my boats on the great scale, and where every intelligent blacksmith and carpenter can go and measure them, copy them, and make a successful steamboat, were formerly known, how is it that Mr. Stevens, Chancellor Livingston, Mr. Rumsey, Mr. Fitch, Lord Stanhope, and Oliver Evans could not find them in

twenty years' labor and at the expense of $100,000? Why were not steamboats made ten years ago? for Charnock's book has been published fifteen years. And here let me present to you a curious fact: the experiments in that book were in great part conducted by Lord Stanhope, who himself since failed in his experiments on steamboats; and, if you have not yet so far affected my character for truth that my countrymen will cease to believe me, I will state another fact: he (Lord Stanhope) in October, 1806, told me in London that I could not construct a successful steamboat on the principles and combinations I proposed and which I now practise with complete success. Consequently, that book does not show how to construct a steamboat any more than the multiplication table shows how to calculate an eclipse; yet the multiplication table is useful to those who know how to apply it to that purpose. But, now that I have succeeded, contrary to all public belief, though, as you say, without the merit of invention, you collect a basket of scraps, conjectures, and abortive essays, out of which, by a kind of magical sophistry, you attempt to place before a discerning committee a successful steamboat of some twenty years old. Suppose you were to collect a basket of old ballads and bad verse without ideas, but rhyming and containing the twenty-four letters of the alphabet, could you not from those parts used by Pope prove that he did not conceive or invent the Dunciad or Essay on Man and Criticism? Or, could you or Mr. Dodd have got his manuscript and put the strokes on his t's, might you not insist that you had made an important improvement, then print and sell the poems as your own? for such is exactly the kind of improvements you and Mr. Dodd have made on steamboats. But there is not so much to be made by such improvements on poetry as by moving parallel links from one part of a steam-engine to another: hence avarice suffers poets, particularly bad ones, to be tranquil, nor does it interfere with unsuccessful mechanicians. It is only the successful artists — they who really benefit their country — that are fit subjects for plunder. Cupidity never encroached on Fitch or Rumsey or on Lord Stanhope. They were not so fortunate as to succeed and exhibit profits. It even left tranquillity to me in 1807 and 1808. In those years the permanent success was not fully established nor the profits visible, but in 1809 they were. Then envy and avarice combined to destroy the inventor. Yet with these facts, known to every

candid man in this State, you say steamboats are an old invention; and you have purchased from Fitch's heirs all their right to his invention. But his heirs, however, had no right; for his patent had expired five years before you purchased, and his invention, if good for anything, is public property. But, now that you have purchased Fitch's invention, as you say, for a valuable consideration, but, as it is believed at Trenton, for a mere nominal sum, that you might possess a phantom to frighten me or to perform in your exhibitions to the public, why have you not built your boat like his, with paddles behind and chain communications? It must be that you had not so much confidence in his invention as in mine; and for the good reason that he failed, but I had succeeded. And now, sir, permit me to make a remark on your logic. You say Fitch is an inventor, that his invention merits protection; yet you do not use any one part of it. There is no part of his invention in your boat Sea Horse. Mr. Daniel D. Dodd is also an inventor, as you say, of one link in your great chain of argument; and yet Fulton, who investigated and combined just principles, constructed and gave to the world steamboats at the time the world had not one steamboat and the project was deemed visionary,— this Fulton, according to your logic, is an impostor and no inventor. Why, sir, there is something so flimsy and totally ignorant of mechanical combination and inventor's rights in all these, your assertions, that it is an insult on common sense to state them to any man who has the least penetration.

Having said so much, I have sent to Albany a copy of that part of my patent which contains extracts from Charnock's tables. It is attested by the clerk of the court to be a true copy. I have also sent a true copy of Fitch's patent, to show how much unlike it is to my boats and the one you have copied from me; and I have sent the certificates of two experienced English engineers, who are now engaged in Talman & Ward's manufactory in the Bowery, who state that the links claimed by Mr. Dodd as his invention and an important improvement have been to all Bolton & Watt's engines for fourteen years. When I put these links in my patent, I did not patent them exclusively for all kinds of machinery; nor did I patent the steam-engine or Charnock's tables. I made use of all these parts to express my ideas of a whole combination new in mechanics, producing a new and desired effect, giving them

their powers and proportions indispensable to their present success in constructing steamboats; and these principles — those powers and parts which I combined for steamboats, and which never before had been brought together in any steamboat — I patented for that purpose and no other, as every artist who invents a new and useful machine must compose it of known parts of other machines. So in patent medicines,— Lee's bilious pills: he did not invent their elements, but combined certain ingredients in certain proportions to make a useful medicine, in which the just proportions are absolutely necessary and part of the invention, as in mechanics the discovery of the proportion of the parts which produce the desired effect make part of the invention.

As you have been heard before the committee and a crowded house in pleading your own cause in your own way, carefully using only such arguments as you hoped would destroy me, I have thus sought the indulgence of a generous public to hear my statement of facts, none of which you can disprove. And now, sir, I leave your merits and mine to the honest and noble feelings of the penetrating gentlemen of this truly great and honorable State. They cannot be mistaken in your view. It is to seize on the property of mind — the fruit of ten years of my ardent studies and labor — and apply it to your own use, thereby destroying forever all confidence in contracts with this State and placing the property of inventors in a position so insecure as to destroy every mental exertion.

FULTON'S LETTERS ON THE FIRST VOYAGE OF THE CLERMONT.

To the Editor of the American Citizen: —

Sir,— I arrived this afternoon at four o'clock in the steamboat from Albany. As the success of my experiment gives me great hopes that such boats may be rendered of great importance to my country, to prevent erroneous opinions and give some satisfaction to my friends of useful improvements, you will have the goodness to publish the following statement of facts: —

I left New York on Monday at one o'clock, and arrived at Clermont, the seat of Chancellor Livingston, at one o'clock on Tuesday: time, twenty-four hours: distance, one hundred and

ten miles. On Wednesday I departed from the Chancellor's at nine in the morning, and arrived at Albany at five in the afternoon: distance, forty miles; time, eight hours. The sum is one hundred and fifty miles in thirty-two hours, equal to near five miles an hour.

On Thursday, at nine o'clock in the morning, I left Albany, and arrived at the Chancellor's at six in the evening. I started from thence at seven, and arrived at New York at four in the afternoon: time, thirty hours; space run through, one hundred and fifty miles, equal to five miles an hour. Throughout my whole way, both going and returning, the wind was ahead. No advantage could be derived from my sails. The whole has therefore been performed by the power of the steam-engine.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT FULTON.

To Joel Barlow: —

My steamboat voyage to Albany and back has turned out rather more favorably than I had calculated. The distance from New York to Albany is one hundred and fifty miles. I ran it up in thirty-two hours, and down in thirty. I had a light breeze against me the whole way, both going and coming; and the voyage has been performed wholly by the power of the steam-engine. I overtook many sloops and schooners beating to windward, and parted with them as if they had been at anchor.

The power of propelling boats by steam is now fully proved. The morning I left New York, there were not perhaps thirty persons in the city who believed that the boat would ever move one mile an hour or be of the least utility; and, while we were putting off from the wharf, which was crowded with spectators, I heard a number of sarcastic remarks. This is the way in which ignorant men compliment what they call philosophers and projectors.

Having employed much time, money, and zeal in accomplishing this work, it gives me, as it will you, great pleasure to see it answer my expectations. It will give a cheap and quick conveyance to the merchandise on the Mississippi, Missouri, and other great rivers, which are now laying open their treasures to the enterprise of our countrymen; and, although the prospect of personal emolument has been some inducement to me, yet I feel infinitely more pleasure in reflecting on the

immense advantage my country will derive from the invention, etc.

THE FIRST VOYAGE OF THE CLERMONT.

Reminiscences of H. Freeland, in a letter to J. F. Reigart, 1856.

It was in the early autumn of the year 1807 that a knot of villagers was gathered on a high bluff just opposite Poughkeepsie, on the west bank of the Hudson, attracted by the appearance of a strange, dark looking craft, which was slowly making its way up the river. Some imagined it to be a sea monster, while others did not hesitate to express their belief that it was a sign of the approaching judgment. What seemed strange in the vessel was the substitution of lofty and straight black smoke-pipes rising from the deck, instead of the gracefully tapered masts that commonly stood on the vessels navigating the stream, and, in place of the spars and rigging, the curious play of the working-beam and pistons and the slow turning and splashing of the huge and naked paddle-wheels met the astonished gaze. The dense clouds of smoke, as they rose wave upon wave, added still more to the wonderment of the rustics.

This strange looking craft was the Clermont on her trial trip to Albany, and of the little knot of villagers mentioned above, the writer, then a boy in his eighth year, with his parents, formed a part; and I well remember the scene, one so well fitted to impress a lasting picture upon the mind of a child accustomed to watch the vessels that passed up and down the river.

The forms of four persons were distinctly visible on the deck as she passed the bluff,— one of whom, doubtless, was Robert Fulton, who had on board with him all the cherished hopes of years, the most precious cargo the wonderful boat could carry.

On her return trip the curiosity she excited was scarcely less intense; the whole country talked of nothing but the sea monster belching forth fire and smoke. The fishermen became terrified and rowed homewards, and they saw nothing but destruction devastating their fishing grounds, while the wreaths of black vapor and the rushing noise of the paddle-wheels, foaming with the stirred up waters, produced great excitement among the boatmen, until it was more intelligent than before; for the character of that curious boat, and the nature of the enterprise which she was pioneering, had been ascertained. From that time, Robert Fulton, Esq., became known and respected as the author and builder of the *first steam packet*, from which we plainly see the rapid improvement in commerce and civilization. Who can doubt that Fulton's first packet boat has been the model steamer? Except in finer finish and greater size,

there is no difference between it and the splendid steamships now crossing the Atlantic. Who can doubt that Fulton saw the meeting of all nations upon his boats, gathering together in unity and harmony, that the "freedom of the seas would be the happiness of the earth"? Who can doubt that Fulton saw the world circumnavigated by steam, and that his invention was carrying the messages of freedom to every land, that no man could tell all its benefits, or describe all its wonders? What a wonderful achievement! What a splendid triumph!

The truth undoubtedly is that Fulton was not "the inventor of the steamboat," and that the reputation acquired by his successful introduction of steam navigation is largely accidental, and is principally due to the possession, in company with Livingston, of a monopoly which drove from this most promising field those original and skilful engineers, Evans and the Stevenses. No one of the essential devices successfully used by Fulton in the Clermont, his first North River steamboat, was new; and no one of them differed, to any great extent, from devices successfully adopted by earlier experimenters. Fulton's success was a commercial success purely. John Stevens had, in 1804, built a successful *screw* steamvessel; and his paddle-steamer of 1807, the Phœnix, was very possibly a better piece of engineering than the Clermont. John Fitch had, still earlier, used both screw and paddle. In England, Miller and Symington and Lord Dundas had antedated even Fulton's earliest experiments on the Seine. Indeed, it seems not at all unlikely that Papin, a century earlier (in 1707), had he been given a monopoly of steam navigation on the Weser or the Fulda, and had he been joyfully hailed by the Hanoverians as a public benefactor, as was Fulton in the United States, instead of being proscribed and assaulted by the mob who destroyed his earlier Clermont, might have been equally successful; or it may be that the French inventor, Jouffroy, who experimented on the rivers of France twenty-five years before Fulton, might, with similar encouragement, have gained an equal success.

Yet, although Fulton was not in any true sense "the inventor of the steamboat," his services in the work of introducing that miracle of our modern time cannot be overestimated; and, aside from his claim as the first to grasp success among the many who were then bravely struggling to place steam navigation on a permanent and safe basis, he is undeniably entitled to all the praise that has ever been accorded him on such different ground.

It is to Robert Fulton that we owe the fact that to-day the rivers of our own country, and those of the world as well, are traversed by steamers of all sizes and all kinds, and by boats suited to every kind

of traffic; that the ocean floats, in every clime and in all its harbors, fleets of great steamers, transporting passengers and merchandise from the United States to Europe, from Liverpool to Hong-Kong, from London to Melbourne, traversing the "doldrums" as steadily and safely and as rapidly as the regions of the trades or either temperate zone. Steam navigation without Fulton would undoubtedly have become an established fact; but no one can say how long the world, without that great engineer and statesman, would have been compelled to wait, or how much the progress of the world might have been retarded by his failure, had it occurred. The name of Fulton well deserves to be coupled with those of Newcomen and Watt, the inventors of the steam-engine; with those of George and Robert Stephenson, the builders of the railway; and with those of Morse and Bell, who have given us the telegraph and the telephone.— *Robert H. Thurston.*

"Robert Fulton has often, if not generally, been assumed to have been the inventor of the steamboat, as Watt is generally supposed to be the inventor of the steam-engine, which constitutes its motive apparatus. But this notion is quite incorrect. The invention of the steam-engine and that of the steamboat alike are the results of the inventive genius not of any one man nor of any dozen men. Fulton simply took the products of the genius of other mechanics, and set them at work in combination, and then applied the already known steamboat, in his more satisfactorily proportioned form, to a variety of useful purposes, and with final success. It is this which constitutes Fulton's claim upon the gratitude and the remembrance of the nations; and it is quite enough."

The early chapters of Admiral George H. Preble's "History of Steam Navigation" give a very complete account of the various efforts to construct and work steamboats before the time of Fulton. The account by Robert R. Livingston, in the January, 1812, number of the *American Medical and Philosophical Register* of New York, reprinted in the present leaflet, is of great historical value, as Livingston's own efforts in this direction, both in association with Fulton and earlier, were of such signal importance. It should be noted that in the April, 1812, number of the *Register*, Colonel John Stevens of Hoboken, the most active of Fulton's rivals, published a rejoinder to Livingston, criticising his letter for "numerous incorrect and defective statements" concerning himself, and showing that he had formed plans for the application of steam power to navigation as early as 1789, and was at work on construction as early, at least, as 1791. "Stevens," says Thurston, "was the greatest professional engineer and naval architect living at the beginning of the present century. He exhibited a better knowledge of engineering than any man of his time, and entertained and urged more advanced opinions and more statesmanlike views in relation to the economical importance of the improvement of the steam-engine, both on land and water, than seem to have been attributable to any other leading engineer of that time, not excepting Robert Fulton."

Livingston pays proper tribute to John Fitch for the first attempt in

America to apply steam to navigation in 1783. The career of this man of marvellous inventive genius was a pathetic one. Only the lack of "property," to which Livingston rightly ascribes so large a part of the success of the Clermont experiment, prevented John Fitch from achieving the triumph and the fame now associated with the name of Fulton. "The day will come," he wrote in his autobiography, "when some more powerful man will get fame and riches from my invention; but nobody will believe that poor John Fitch can do anything worthy of attention." He constructed steamboats with paddles, and also successfully applied the screw-propeller. "This," he wrote to David Rittenhouse in 1792, speaking of the steam-engine, "whether I bring it to perfection or not, will be the mode of crossing the Atlantic, in time, for packets and armed vessels." There is a Life of Fitch by Thompson Westcott, containing many selections from his autobiography. The Life in Sparks's "American Biography" is by Whittlesey, who also wrote an impressive paper, "Justice to the Memory of John Fitch," for the *Western Literary Journal and Monthly Review* for February, 1845, reprinted in pamphlet form. There is much interesting matter concerning Fitch, largely communicated by Daniel Langstreth, the younger, in Watson's "Annals of Philadelphia." See also Fitch's own pamphlet, "The Original Steamboat Supported," a reply (1788) to the claims of J. Rumsey.

The earliest important Life of Fulton is that by his friend Cadwallader D. Colden, published in 1817. The Life by Reigart (1856), for the most part a plagiarism from Colden, is a fulsome work, which derives its value from some original letters included (one from H. Freeland, reprinted in the present leaflet, describing the appearance of the Clermont in her first trip up the Hudson) and the reproduction of many of Fulton's sketches and pictures, including his colored illustrations to Barlow's "Columbiad." The Life in Sparks's series is by James Renwick. There is an admirable brief biography by Robert H. Thurston, in the "Makers of America" series; and a capital book for the young people is the "Life of Robert Fulton, and History of Steam Navigation," by Thomas W. Knox. Preble's "History of Steam Navigation" contains original accounts of the first voyage of the Clermont not found in the other books. There is controversy as to the actual date of the first voyage; but it seems to have been August 11, 1807. Fulton became involved in litigation concerning his patents and various rights; and it was in connection with this that he wrote the letter addressed to Aaron Ogden, printed in the present leaflet, which is the most interesting statement of his claim as inventor of the steamboat.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

176

Old South Leaflets.

No. 109.

The Ground of the Free School System.

By HORACE MANN.

From his Tenth Annual Report as Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, 1846.

The Pilgrim Fathers amid all their privations and dangers conceived the magnificent idea, not only of a universal, but of a free education for the whole people. To find the time and the means to reduce this grand conception to practice, they stinted themselves, amid all their poverty, to a still scantier pittance; amid all their toils, they imposed upon themselves still more burdensome labors; and, amid all their perils, they braved still greater dangers. Two divine ideas filled their great hearts,—their duty to God and to posterity. For the one they built the church, for the other they opened the school. Religion and knowledge,—two attributes of the same glorious and eternal truth, and that truth the only one on which immortal or mortal happiness can be securely founded!

It is impossible for us adequately to conceive the boldness of the measure which aimed at universal education through the establishment of free schools. As a fact, it had no precedent in the world's history; and, as a theory, it could have been refuted and silenced by a more formidable array of argument and experience than was ever marshalled against any other institution of human origin. But time has ratified its soundness. Two centuries of successful operation now proclaim it to be as wise as it was courageous, and as beneficent as it was disinterested. Every community in the civilized world awards it the meed of praise; and states at home and nations abroad, in the

order of their intelligence, are copying the bright example. What we call the enlightened nations of Christendom are approaching, by slow degrees, to the moral elevation which our ancestors reached at a single bound. . . .

The alleged ground upon which the founders of our free-school system proceeded when adopting it did not embrace the whole argument by which it may be defended and sustained. Their insight was better than their reason. They assumed a ground, indeed, satisfactory and convincing to Protestants; but at that time only a small portion of Christendom was Protestant, and even now only a minority of it is so. The very ground on which our free schools were founded, therefore, if it were the only one, would have been a reason with more than half of Christendom for their immediate abolition.

In later times, and since the achievement of American independence, the universal and ever-repeated argument in favor of free schools has been that the general intelligence which they are capable of diffusing, and which can be imparted by no other human instrumentality, is indispensable to the continuance of a republican government. This argument, it is obvious, assumes, as a *postulatum*, the superiority of a republican over all other forms of government; and, as a people, we religiously believe in the soundness both of the assumption and of the argument founded upon it. But, if this be all, then a sincere monarchist, or a defender of arbitrary power, or a believer in the divine right of kings, would oppose free schools for the identical reasons we offer in their behalf. . . .

Again, the expediency of free schools is sometimes advocated on grounds of political economy. An educated people is always a more industrious and productive people. Intelligence is a primary ingredient in the wealth of nations. . . . The moralist, too, takes up the argument of the economist. He demonstrates that vice and crime are not only prodigals and spendthrifts of their own, but defrauders and plunderers of the means of others, that they would seize upon all the gains of honest industry and exhaust the bounties of Heaven itself without satiating their rapacity; and that often in the history of the world whole generations might have been trained to industry and virtue by the wealth which one enemy to his race has destroyed.

And yet, notwithstanding these views have been presented a thousand times with irrefutable logic, and with a divine elo-

quence of truth which it would seem that nothing but combined stolidity and depravity could resist, there is not at the present time, [1846] with the exception of the States of New England and a few small communities elsewhere, a country or a state in Christendom which maintains a system of free schools for the education of its children. . . .

I believe that this amazing dereliction from duty, especially in our own country, originates more in the false notions which men entertain *respecting the nature of their right to property* than in any thing else. In the district school meeting, in the town meeting, in legislative halls, everywhere, the advocates for a more generous education could carry their respective audiences with them in behalf of increased privileges for our children, were it not instinctively foreseen that increased privileges must be followed by increased taxation. Against this obstacle, argument falls dead. The rich man who has no children declares that the exaction of a contribution from him to educate the children of his neighbor is an invasion of his rights of property. The man who has reared and educated a family of children denounces it as a double tax when he is called upon to assist in educating the children of others also; or, if he has reared his own children without educating them, he thinks it peculiarly oppressive to be obliged to do for others what he refrained from doing even for himself. Another, having children, but disdaining to educate them with the common mass, withdraws them from the public school, puts them under what he calls "selecter influences," and then thinks it a grievance to be obliged to support a school which he contemns. Or, if these different parties so far yield to the force of traditionary sentiment and usage, and to the public opinion around them, as to consent to do something for the cause, they soon reach the limit of expense at which their admitted obligation or their alleged charity terminates.

It seems not irrelevant, therefore, in this connection, and for the purpose of strengthening the foundation on which our free-school system reposes, to inquire into the nature of a man's right to the property he possesses, and to satisfy ourselves respecting the question whether any man has such an indefeasible title to his estates or such an absolute ownership of them as renders it unjust in the government to assess upon him his share of the expenses of educating the children of the community up to such a point as the nature of the institutions under which he lives, and the well-being of society, require.

I believe in the existence of a great, immortal, immutable principle of natural law, or natural ethics,— a principle antecedent to all human institutions, and incapable of being abrogated by any ordinance of man,— a principle of divine origin, clearly legible in the ways of Providence as those ways are manifested in the order of nature and in the history of the race, which proves the *absolute right* to an education of every human being that comes into the world, and which, of course, proves the correlative duty of every government to see that the means of that education are provided for all.

In regard to the application of this principle of natural law, — that is, in regard to the extent of the education to be provided for all at the public expense,— some differences of opinion may fairly exist under different political organizations; but, under our republican government, it seems clear that the minimum of this education can never be less than such as is sufficient to qualify each citizen for the civil and social duties he will be called to discharge,— such an education as teaches the individual the great laws of bodily health, as qualifies for the fulfilment of parental duties, as is indispensable for the civil functions of a witness or a juror, as is necessary for the voter in municipal and in national affairs, and, finally, as is requisite for the faithful and conscientious discharge of all those duties which devolve upon the inheritor of a portion of the sovereignty of this great republic. . . . So far is it from being a wrong or a hardship to demand of the possessors of property their respective shares for the prosecution of this divinely ordained work, that they themselves are guilty of the most far-reaching injustice when they seek to resist or to evade the contribution. The complainers are the wrong-doers. The cry, "Stop thief!" comes from the thief himself.

To any one who looks beyond the mere surface of things, it is obvious that the primary and natural elements or ingredients of all property consist in the riches of the soil, in the treasures of the sea, in the light and warmth of the sun, in the fertilizing clouds and streams and dews, in the winds, and in the chemical and vegetative agencies of Nature. In the majority of cases, all that we call *property*, all that makes up the valuation or inventory of a nation's capital, was prepared at the creation, and was laid up of old in the capacious storehouses of Nature. For every unit that a man earns by his own toil or skill, he receives hundreds and thousands, without cost and without

recompense, from the all-bountiful Giver. A proud mortal, standing in the midst of his luxuriant wheat-fields or cotton-plantations, may arrogantly call them his own; yet what barren wastes would they be, did not Heaven send down upon them its dews and its rains, its warmth and its light, and sustain, for their growth and ripening, the grateful vicissitude of the seasons! It is said that from eighty to ninety per cent. of the very substance of some of the great staples of agriculture are not taken from the earth, but are absorbed from the air; so that these productions may more properly be called fruits of the atmosphere than of the soil. Who prepares this elemental wealth? Who scatters it, like a sower, through all the regions of the atmosphere, and sends the richly freighted winds, as His messengers, to bear to each leaf in the forest, and to each blade in the cultivated field, the nourishment which their infinitely varied needs demand? Aided by machinery, a single manufacturer performs the labor of hundreds of men. Yet what could he accomplish without the weight of the waters which God causes ceaselessly to flow, or without those gigantic forces which he has given to steam? And how would the commerce of the world be carried on, were it not for those great laws of Nature — of electricity, of condensation, and of rarefaction — that give birth to the winds, which, in conformity to the will of Heaven and not in obedience to any power of man, forever traverse the earth, and offer themselves as an unchartered medium for interchanging the products of all the zones? These few references show how vast a proportion of all the wealth which men presumptuously call their own, because they claim to have earned it, is poured into their lap, unasked and unthanked for, by the Being so infinitely gracious in his physical as well as in his moral bestowments.

But for whose subsistence and benefit were these exhaustless treasuries of wealth created? Surely not for any one man, nor for any one generation, but for the subsistence and benefit of the whole race from the beginning to the end of time. They were not created for Adam alone, nor for Noah alone, nor for the first discoverers or colonists who may have found or have peopled any part of the earth's ample domain. No. They were created for the race collectively, but to be possessed and enjoyed in succession as the generations, one after another, should come into existence,— equal rights, with a successive enjoyment of them. If we consider the earth and the fulness

thereof as one great habitation or domain, then each generation, subject to certain modifications for the encouragement of industry and frugality,— which modifications it is not necessary here to specify,— has only a life-lease in them. There are certain reasonable regulations, indeed, in regard to the outgoing and the incoming tenants,— regulations which allow to the outgoing generations a brief control over their property after they are called upon to leave it, and which also allow the incoming generations to anticipate a little their full right of possession. But, subject to these regulations, nature ordains a perpetual entail and transfer from one generation to another of all property in the great, substantive, enduring elements of wealth,— in the soil, in metals and minerals, in precious stones, and in more precious coal and iron and granite, in the waters and winds and sun; and no one man, nor any one generation of men, has any such title to or ownership in these ingredients and substantials of all wealth that his right is evaded when a portion of them is taken for the benefit of posterity.

This great principle of natural law may be illustrated by a reference to some of the unstable elements, in regard to which each individual's right of *property* is strongly qualified in relation to his contemporaries, even while he has the acknowledged right of *possession*. Take the streams of water or the wind, for an example. A stream, as it descends from its sources to its mouth, is successively the property of all those through whose land it passes. My neighbor who lives above me owned it yesterday, while it was passing through his lands: I own it to-day, while it is descending through mine; and the contiguous proprietor below will own it to-morrow, while it is flowing through his, as it passes onward to the next. But the rights of these successive owners are not absolute and unqualified. They are limited by the rights of those who are entitled to the subsequent possession and use. While a stream is passing through my lands, I may not corrupt it, so that it shall be offensive or valueless to the adjoining proprietor below. I may not stop it in its downward course, nor divert it into any other direction, so that it shall leave this channel dry. I may lawfully use it for various purposes — for agriculture, as in irrigating lands or watering cattle; for manufactures, as in turning wheels, etc.; — but, in all my uses of it, I must pay regard to the rights of my neighbors lower down. So no two proprietors, nor any half-dozen proprietors, by conspiring together, can de-

prive an owner, who lives below them all, of the ultimate right which he has to the use of the stream in its descending course. We see here, therefore, that a man has certain qualified rights — rights of which he cannot lawfully be divested without his own consent — in a stream of water before it reaches the limits of his own estate, at which latter point he may somewhat more emphatically call it his own. And, in this sense, a man who lives at the outlet of a river, on the margin of the ocean, has certain incipient rights in those fountain-sources that well up from the earth at the distance of thousands of miles. . . .

In one respect, the winds illustrate our relative rights and duties even better than the streams. In the latter case the rights are not only successive, but always in the same order of priority, those of the owner above necessarily preceding those of the owner below. . . . In the case of the winds, however, which blow from every quarter of the heavens, I may have the prior right to-day; but, with a change in their direction, my neighbor may have it to-morrow. If, therefore, to-day, when the wind is going from me to him, I should usurp the right to use it to his detriment, to-morrow, when it is coming from him to me, he may inflict retributive usurpation upon me.

The light of the sun, too, is subject to the same benign and equitable regulations. As the waves of this ethereal element pass by me, I have a right to bask in their genial warmth or to employ their quickening powers; but I have no right, even on my own land, to build up a wall mountain-high that shall eclipse the sun to my neighbor's eyes.

Now all these great principles of natural law which define and limit the rights of neighbors and contemporaries are incorporated into and constitute a part of the civil law of every civilized people; and they are obvious and simple illustrations of the great proprietary laws by which individuals and generations hold their rights in the solid substance of the globe, in the elements that move over its surface, and in the chemical and vital powers with which it is so marvellously endued. As successive owners on a river's bank have equal rights to the waters that flow through their respective domains, subject only to the modification that the proprietors nearer the stream's source must have precedence in the enjoyment of their rights over those lower down, so the rights of all the generations of mankind to the earth itself, to the streams that fertilize it, to the winds that purify it, to the vital principles that animate it,

and to the reviving light, are common rights, though subject to similar modifications in regard to the preceding and succeeding generations of men. . . .

Is not the inference irresistible, then, that no man, by whatever means he may have come into possession of his property, has any natural right, any more than he has a moral one, to hold it, or to dispose of it, irrespective of the needs and claims of those who, in the august processions of the generations, are to be his successors on the stage of existence? Holding his rights subject to their rights, he is bound not to impair the value of their inheritance either by commission or by omission.

Generation after generation proceeds from the creative energy of God. Each one stops for a brief period upon the earth, resting, as it were, only for a night, like migratory birds upon their passage, and then leaving it forever to others whose existence is as transitory as its own; and the migratory flocks of water-fowl which sweep across our latitudes in their passage to another clime have as good a right to make a perpetual appropriation to their own use of the lands over which they fly as any one generation has to arrogate perpetual dominion and sovereignty, for its own purposes, over that portion of the earth which it is its fortune to occupy during the brief period of its temporal existence.

Another consideration bearing upon this arrogant doctrine of absolute ownership or sovereignty has hardly less force than the one just expounded. We have seen how insignificant a portion of any man's possessions he can claim in any proper and just sense *to have earned*, and that, in regard to all the residue, he is only taking his turn in the use of a bounty bestowed in common, by the Giver of all, upon his ancestors, upon himself, and upon his posterity,—a line of indefinite length, in which he is but a point. But this is not the only deduction to be made from his assumed rights. The *present* wealth of the world has an additional element in it. Much of all that is capable of being earned by man has been earned by our predecessors, and has come down to us in a solid and enduring form. We have not erected all the houses in which we live, nor constructed all the roads on which we travel, nor built all the ships in which we carry on our commerce with the world. We have not reclaimed from the wilderness all the fields whose harvests we now reap; and, if we had no precious metals or stones or pearls but such as we ourselves

had dug from the mines or brought up from the bottom of the ocean, our coffers and our caskets would be empty indeed. But, even if this were not so, whence came all the arts and sciences, the discoveries and the inventions, without which, and without a common right to which, the valuation of the property of a whole nation would scarcely equal the inventory of a single man,— without which, indeed, we should now be in a state of barbarism? Whence came a knowledge of agriculture, without which we should have so little to reap? or a knowledge of astronomy, without which we could not traverse the oceans? or a knowledge of chemistry and mechanical philosophy, without which the arts and trades could not exist? Most of all this was found out by those who have gone before us; and some of it has come down to us from a remote antiquity. Surely, all these boons and blessings belong as much to posterity as to ourselves. They have not descended to us to be arrested and consumed here or to be sequestrated from the ages to come. Cato and Archimedes, and Kepler and Newton, and Franklin and Arkwright and Fulton, and all the bright host of benefactors to science and art, did not make or bequeath their discoveries or inventions to benefit any one generation, but to increase the common enjoyments of mankind to the end of time. So of all the great lawgivers and moralists who have improved the civil institutions of the state, who have made it dangerous to be wicked, or, far better than this, have made it hateful to be so. Resources developed and property acquired after all these ages of preparation, after all these facilities and securities, accrue, not to the benefit of the possessor only, but to that of the next and of all succeeding generations.

Surely, these considerations limit still more extensively that absoluteness of ownership which is so often claimed by the possessors of wealth.

But sometimes the rich farmer, the opulent manufacturer, or the capitalist, when sorely pressed with his natural and moral obligation to contribute a portion of his means for the education of the young, replies,— either in form or in spirit,— "My lands, my machinery, my gold, and my silver are mine: may I not do what I will with my own?" There is one supposable case, and only one, where this argument would have plausibility. If it were made by an isolated, solitary being,— a being having no relations to a community around him, having no ancestors to whom he had been indebted for ninety-nine

parts in every hundred of all he possesses, and expecting to leave no posterity after him,— it might not be easy to answer it. If there were but one family in this Western hemisphere and only one in the Eastern hemisphere, and these two families bore no civil and social relations to each other, and were to be the first and last of the whole race, it might be difficult, except on very high and almost transcendental grounds, for either one of them to show good cause why the other should contribute to help educate children not his own. And perhaps the force of the appeal for such an object would be still further diminished if the nearest neighbor of a single family upon our planet were as far from the earth as Uranus or Sirius. In self-defence or in selfishness one might say to the other: "What are your fortunes to me? You can neither benefit nor molest me. Let each of us keep to his own side of the planetary spaces." But is this the relation which any man amongst us sustains to his fellows? In the midst of a populous community to which he is bound by innumerable ties, having had his own fortune and condition almost predetermined and foreordained by his predecessors, and being about to exert upon his successors as commanding an influence as has been exerted upon himself, the objector can no longer shrink into his individuality, and disclaim connection and relationship with the world at large. He cannot deny that there are thousands around him on whom he acts, and who are continually reacting upon him. The earth is much too small or the race is far too numerous to allow us to be hermits, and therefore we cannot adopt either the philosophy or the morals of hermits. All have derived benefits from their ancestors; and all are bound, as by an oath, to transmit those benefits, even in an improved condition, to posterity. We may as well attempt to escape from our own personal identity as to shake off the threefold relation which we bear to others,— the relation of an associate with our contemporaries, of a beneficiary of our ancestors, of a guardian to those who, in the sublime order of Providence, are to succeed us. Out of these relations, manifest duties are evolved. The society of which we necessarily constitute a part must be preserved; and, in order to preserve it, we must not look merely to what one individual or one family needs, but to what the whole community needs, not merely to what one generation needs, but to the wants of a succession of generations. To draw conclusions without considering these facts is to leave out the most important part of the premises.

A powerfully corroborating fact remains untouched. Though the earth and the beneficent capabilities with which it is endued belong in common to the race, yet we find that previous and present possessors have laid their hands upon the whole of it,— have left no part of it unclaimed and unappropriated. They have circumnavigated the globe; they have drawn lines across every habitable portion of it, and have partitioned amongst themselves not only its whole area or superficial contents, but have claimed it down to the centre and up to the concave,— a great inverted pyramid for each proprietor,— so that not an unclaimed rood is left, either in the caverns below or in the aërial spaces above, where a new adventurer upon existence can take unresisted possession. They have entered into a solemn compact with each other for the mutual defence of their respective allotments. They have created legislators and judges and executive officers, who denounce and inflict penalties even to the taking of life; and they have organized armed bands to repel aggression upon their claims. Indeed, so grasping and rapacious have mankind been in this particular, that they have taken more than they could use, more than they could perambulate and survey, more than they could see from the top of the masthead or from the highest peak of the mountain. There was some limit to their physical power of taking possession, but none to the exorbitancy of their desires. Like robbers, who divide their spoils before they know whether they shall find a victim, men have claimed a continent while still doubtful of its existence, and spread out their title from ocean to ocean before their most adventurous pioneers had ever seen a shore of the realms they coveted. The whole planet, then, having been appropriated,— there being no waste or open lands from which the new generations may be supplied as they come into existence,— have not those generations the strongest conceivable claim upon the present occupants for that which is indispensable to their well-being? They have more than a pre-emptive, they have a possessory right to some portion of the issues and profits of that general domain, all of which has been thus taken up and appropriated. A denial of this right by the present possessors is a breach of trust, a fraudulent misuse of power given and of confidence implied. On mere principles of political economy, it is folly: on the broader principles of duty and morality, it is embezzlement.

It is not at all in contravention of this view of the subject

that the adult portion of society does take, and must take, upon itself the control and management of all existing property until the rising generation has arrived at the age of majority. Nay, one of the objects of their so doing is to preserve the rights of the generation which is still in its minority. Society, to this extent, is only a trustee managing an estate for the benefit of a part owner or of one who has a reversionary interest in it. This civil regulation, therefore, made necessary even for the benefit of both present and future possessors, is only in furtherance of the great law under consideration.

Coincident, too, with this great law, but in no manner superseding or invalidating it, is that wonderful provision which the Creator has made for the care of offspring in the affection of their parents. Heaven did not rely merely upon our perceptions of duty toward our children and our fidelity in its performance. A powerful, all-mastering instinct of love was therefore implanted in the parental and especially in the maternal breast, to anticipate the idea of duty and to make duty delightful. Yet the great doctrine founded upon the will of God as made known to us in the natural order and relation of things would still remain the same, though all this beautiful portion of our moral being, whence parental affection springs, were a void and a nonenity. Emphatically would the obligations of society remain the same for all those children who have been bereaved of parents, or who, worse than bereavement, have only monster parents of intemperance or cupidity, or of any other of those forms of vice that seem to suspend or to obliterate the law of love in the parental breast. For these society is doubly bound to be a parent, and to exercise all that rational care and providence which a wise father would exercise for his own children.

If the previous argument began with sound premises, and has been logically conducted, then it has established this position,— that a vast portion of the present wealth of the world either consists in, or has been immediately derived from, those great natural substances and powers of the earth which were bestowed by the Creator alike on all mankind; or from the discoveries, inventions, labors, and improvements of our ancestors, which were alike designed for the common benefit of all their descendants. The question now arises, *At what time* is this wealth to be transferred from a preceding to a succeeding generation? At what point are the latter to take possession of

it or to derive benefit from it? or at what time are the former to surrender it in their behalf? Is each existing generation, and each individual of an existing generation, to hold fast to his possessions until death relaxes his grasp? or is something of the right to be acknowledged, and something of the benefit to be yielded, beforehand? It seems too obvious for argument that the latter is the only alternative. If the incoming generation have no rights until the outgoing generation have actually retired, then is every individual that enters the world liable to perish on the day he is born. According to the very constitution of things, each individual must obtain sustenance and succor as soon as his eyes open in quest of light or his lungs gasp for the first breath of air. His wants cannot be delayed until he himself can supply them. If the demands of his nature are ever to be answered, they must be answered years before he can make any personal provision for them, either by the performance of any labor or by any exploits of skill. The infant must be fed before he can earn his bread, he must be clothed before he can prepare garments, he must be protected from the elements before he can erect a dwelling; and it is just as clear that he must be instructed before he can engage or reward a tutor. A course contrary to this would be the destruction of the young, that we might rob them of their rightful inheritance. Carried to its extreme, it would be the act of Herod, seeking in a general massacre the life of one who was supposed to endanger his power. Here, then, the claims of the succeeding generation, not only upon the affection and the care, but upon the *property*, of the preceding one, attach. God having given to the second generation as full and complete a right to the incomes and profits of the world as he has given to the first, and to the third generation as full and complete a right as he has given to the second, and so on while the world stands, it necessarily follows that children must come into a partial and qualified possession of these rights by the paramount law of nature, as soon as they are born. No human enactment can abolish or countervail this paramount and supreme law; and all those positive and often arbitrary enactments of the civil code, by which, for the encouragement of industry and frugality, the possessor of property is permitted to control it for a limited period after his decease, must be construed and executed in subservience to this sovereign and irrepealable ordinance of nature.

Nor is this transfer always, or even generally, to be made in *kind*, but according to the needs of the recipient. The recognition of this principle is universal. A guardian or trustee may possess lands while the ward or owner under the trust may need money, or the former may have money while the latter need raiment or shelter. The form of the estate must be changed, if need be, and adapted to the wants of the receiver.

The claim of a child, then, to a portion of pre-existent property, begins with the first breath he draws. The new-born infant must have sustenance and shelter and care. If the natural parents are removed or parental ability fails, in a word, if parents either cannot or will not supply the infant's wants,— then society at large — the government having assumed to itself the ultimate control of all property — is bound to step in and fill the parent's place. To deny this to any child would be equivalent to a sentence of death, a capital execution of the innocent,— at which every soul shudders. It would be a more cruel form of infanticide than any which is practised in China or in Africa.

But to preserve the animal life of a child only, and there to stop, would be, not the bestowment of a blessing or the performance of a duty, but the infliction of a fearful curse. A child has interests far higher than those of mere physical existence. Better that the wants of the natural life should be disregarded than that the higher interests of the character should be neglected. If a child has any claim to bread to keep him from perishing, he has a far higher claim to knowledge to preserve him from error and its fearful retinue of calamities. If a child has any claim to shelter to protect him from the destroying elements, he has a far higher claim to be rescued from the infamy and perdition of vice and crime.

All moralists agree, nay, all moralists maintain, that a man is as responsible for his omissions as for his commissions; that he is as guilty of the wrong which he could have prevented, but did not, as for that which his own hand has perpetrated. They, then, who knowingly withhold sustenance from a new-born child, and he dies, are guilty of infanticide. And, by the same reasoning, they who refuse to enlighten the intellect of the rising generation are guilty of degrading the human race. They who refuse to train up children in the way they should go are training up incendiaries and madmen to destroy property and life, and to invade and pollute the sanctuaries of soci-

ety. In a word, if the mind is as real and substantive a part of human existence as the body, then mental attributes, during the periods of infancy and childhood, demand provision at least as imperatively as bodily appetites. The time when these respective obligations attach corresponds with the periods when the nurture, whether physical or mental, is needed. As the right of sustenance is of equal date with birth, so the right of intellectual and moral training begins at least as early as when children are ordinarily sent to school. At that time, then, by the irrepealable law of Nature, every child succeeds to so much more of the property of the community as is necessary for his education. He is to receive this, not in the form of lands, or of gold and silver, but in the form of knowledge and a training to good habits. This is one of the steps in the transfer of property from a present to a succeeding generation. Human sagacity may be at fault in fixing the amount of property to be transferred or the time when the transfer should be made to a dollar or to an hour; but certainly, in a republican government, the obligation of the predecessors, and the right of the successors, extend to and embrace the means of such an amount of education as will prepare each individual to perform all the duties which devolve upon him as a man and a citizen. It may go farther than this point: certainly, it cannot fall short of it.

Under our political organization the places and the processes where this transfer is to be provided for, and its amount determined, are the district-school meeting, the town-meeting, legislative halls, and conventions for establishing or revising the fundamental laws of the State. If it be not done there, society is false to its high trusts; and any community, whether national or state, that ventures to organize a government, or to administer a government already organized, without making provision for the free education of all its children, dares the certain vengeance of Heaven; and in the squalid forms of poverty and destitution, in the scourges of violence and misrule, in the heart-destroying corruptions of licentiousness and debauchery, and in political profligacy and legalized perfidy, in all the blended and mutually aggravated crimes of civilization and barbarism, will be sure to feel the terrible retributions of its delinquency.

I bring my argument on this point, then, to a close; and I present a test of its validity, which, as it seems to me, defies denial or evasion.

In obedience to the laws of God and to the laws of all civilized communities, society is bound to protect the natural life of children; and this natural life cannot be protected without the appropriation and use of a portion of the property which society possesses. We prohibit infanticide under penalty of death. We practise a refinement in this particular. The life of an infant is inviolable, even before he is born; and he who feloniously takes it, even before birth, is as subject to the extreme penalty of the law as though he had struck down manhood in its vigor, or taken away a mother by violence from the sanctuary of home where she blesses her offspring. But why preserve the natural life of a child, why preserve unborn embryos of life, if we do not intend to watch over and to protect them, and to expand their subsequent existence into usefulness and happiness? As individuals, or as an organized community, we have no natural right, we can derive no authority or countenance from reason, we can cite no attribute or purpose of the divine nature, for giving birth to any human being, and then inflicting upon that being the curse of ignorance, of poverty, and of vice, with all their attendant calamities. We are brought, then, to this startling but inevitable alternative,— the natural life of an infant should be extinguished as soon as it is born, or the means should be provided to save that life from being a curse to its possessor; and, therefore, every State is morally bound to enact a code of laws legalizing and enforcing infanticide or a code of laws establishing free schools.

The three following propositions, then, describe the broad and ever-during foundation on which the common-school system of Massachusetts reposes: —

The successive generations of men, taken collectively, constitute one great commonwealth.

The property of this commonwealth is pledged for the education of all its youth, up to such a point as will save them from poverty and vice, and prepare them for the adequate performance of their social and civil duties.

The successive holders of this property are trustees, bound to the faithful execution of their trust by the most sacred obligations; and embezzlement and pillage from children and descendants have not less of criminality, and have more of meanness, than the same offences when perpetrated against contemporaries.

Recognizing these eternal principles of natural ethics, the Constitution of Massachusetts, the fundamental law of the State, after declaring (among other things) in the preamble to the first section of the fifth chapter that "the encouragement of arts and sciences and all good literature tends to the honor of God, the advantage of the Christian religion, and the great benefit of this and the other United States of America," proceeds, in the second section of the same chapter, to set forth the duties of all future legislators and magistrates in the following noble and impressive language: —

"Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties, and as these depend on spreading the opportunities and advantages of education in the various parts of the country and among the different orders of the people, it shall be the duty of legislatures and magistrates in all future periods of this Commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them, especially the university of Cambridge, public schools and grammar schools in the towns; to encourage private societies and public institutions, rewards, and immunities for the promotion of agriculture, arts, sciences, commerce, trade, manufactures, and a natural history of the country; to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in their dealings, sincerity, good humor, and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people." See also Rev. Stat., ch. 23, sect. 7.

Massachusetts is *parental* in her government. More and more, as year after year rolls by, she seeks to substitute prevention for remedy, and rewards for penalties. She strives to make industry the antidote to poverty, and to counterwork the progress of vice and crime by the diffusion of knowledge and the culture of virtuous principles. She seeks not only to mitigate those great physical and mental calamities of which mankind are the sad inheritors, but also to avert those infinitely greater moral calamities which form the disastrous heritage of depraved passions. Hence it has long been her policy to endow or to aid asylums for the cure of disease. She succors and maintains all the poor within her borders, whatever may have been the land of their nativity. She founds and supports hospitals for restoring reason to the insane; and even for those

violators of the law whom she is obliged to sequestrate from society she provides daily instruction and the ministrations of the gospel at the public charge. To those who, in the order of Nature and Providence, have been bereft of the noble faculties of hearing and of speech, she teaches a new language, and opens their imprisoned minds and hearts to conversation with men and to communion with God; and it hardly transcends the literal truth to say that she gives sight to the blind. For the remnants of those aboriginal tribes, who for so many ages roamed over this land without cultivating its soil or elevating themselves in the scale of being, her annual bounty provides good schools; and, when the equal, natural, and constitutional rights of the outcast children of Africa were thought to be invaded, she armed her courts of judicature with power to punish the aggressors. The public highway is not more open and free for every man in the community than is the public schoolhouse for every child; and each parent feels that a free education is as secure a part of the birthright of his offspring as Heaven's bounties of light and air. The State not only commands that the means of education shall be provided for all, but she denounces penalties against all individuals, and all towns and cities, however populous or powerful they may be, that shall presume to stand between her bounty and its recipients. In her righteous code the interception of knowledge is a crime; and, if parents are unable to supply their children with books, she becomes a parent, and supplies them. . . .

Public sentiment exceeds and excels the law. Annually vast sums are given for eleemosynary and charitable purposes,— to promote the cause of temperance, to send the gospel to the heathen, and to diffuse the doctrines of peace, which are the doctrines of the Prince of Peace.

For public, free education alone, including the direct outlay of money and the interest on capital invested, Massachusetts expends annually more than a million of dollars. To support religious institutions for the worship of God and the salvation of men she annually expends more than another million, and what she gives away in the various forms of charity far exceeds a third sum of equal magnitude. She explores the world for new objects of beneficence; and, so deep and common is the feeling which expects and prompts all this that she is gradually changing and ennobling the definition of a cardinal word in the language of morals,— doing what no king or court with

all their authority, nor royal academy with all its sages and literary men, can do: she is changing the meaning of *charity* into *duty*.

For the support of the poor, nine-tenths of whose cost originate with foreigners or come from one prolific vice, whose last convulsive energies she is now struggling to subdue, she annually pays more than three hundred thousand dollars; for the support and improvement of public highways, she pays a much larger sum; and, within the last dozen or fourteen years, she has invested a capital in railroads, within and without the State, of nearly or quite sixty millions of dollars.

Whence comes her means to give with each returning year more than a million of dollars to public education, more than another million to religion, and more than a third to ameliorate and succor the afflicted and the ignorant at home, and to bless, in distant lands, those who sit in the region and shadow of death? How does she support her poor, maintain her public ways, and contribute such vast sums for purposes of internal improvement, besides maintaining her immense commercial transactions with every zone in the world?

Has she a vast domain? Her whole territory would not make a court-yard of respectable dimensions to stand in front of many of the states and territories belonging to the Union. Does she draw revenues from conquered provinces or subjugated realms? She conquers nothing, she subdues nothing, save the great elemental forces of Nature, which God gives freely, whenever and wherever they are asked for in the language of genius and science, and in regard to which no profusion or prodigality to one can diminish the bounty always ready for others.

Does she live by the toil of a race of serfs and vassals whom she holds in personal and hereditary bondage? — by one comprehensive and sovereign act of violence seizing upon both body and soul at once, and superseding the thousand acts of plunder which make up the life of a common robber? Every man who treads her sacred soil is free: all are free alike: and within her borders, for any purpose connected with human slavery, iron will not be welded into a fetter.

Has she rich mines of the precious metals? In all her coffers there is not a drachm of silver or of gold which has not been obtained by the sweat of her brow or the vigor of her brain.

Has she magazines of mineral wealth imbedded in the earth? or are her soil and climate so spontaneously exuberant that she reaps luxuriant harvests from uncultivated fields? Alas! the orator has barbed his satire by declaring her only natural productions to be granite and ice.

Whence, then, I again ask, comes her wealth? I do not mean the gorgeous wealth which is displayed in the voluptuous and too often enervating residences of the affluent, but that *golden mean* of property — such as Agur asked for in his perfect prayer — which carries blessings in its train to thousands of householders, which spreads solid comfort and competence through the dwellings of the land, which furnishes the means of instruction, of social pleasures and refinement to the citizens at large, which saves from the cruel sufferings and the more cruel temptations of penury. The families scattered over her hills and along her valleys have not merely a shelter from the inclemencies of the seasons, but the sanctuary of a home. Not only food, but books, are spread upon their tables. Her commonest houses have the means of hospitality. They have appliances for sickness, and resources laid up against accident and the infirmities of age. Whether in her rural districts or her populous towns, a wandering, native-born beggar is a prodigy: and the twelve millions of dollars deposited in her savings institutions do not more loudly proclaim the frugality and providence of the past than they foretell the competence and enjoyments of the future.

One copious, exhaustless fountain supplies all this abundance. It is education,— the intellectual, moral, and religious education of the people. Having no other mines to work, Massachusetts has mined into the human intellect; and, from its limitless resources, she has won more sustaining and enduring prosperity and happiness than if she had been founded on a stratification of silver and gold, reaching deeper down than geology has yet penetrated. From her high religious convictions she has learned that great lesson,— *to set a value upon time*. Regarding the faculties as the gift of God, she has felt bound both to use and to improve them. Mingling skill and intelligence with the daily occupations of life, she has made labor honorable; and, as a necessary consequence, idleness is disgraceful. Knowledge has been the ambition of her sons, and she has reverenced and venerated the purity and chastity of her matrons and her daughters. At the hearthstone, at the

family table, and at the family altar,— on all those occasions where the structure of the youthful character is *builded up*,— these sentiments of love for knowledge, and of reverence for maidenly virtue, have been *builded in*; and there they stand, so wrought and mingled with the fibres of being that none but God can tell which is Nature and which is education, which we owe primarily to the grace of Heaven and which to the co-operating wisdom of the institutions of men. . . . He who studies the present or the historic character of Massachusetts will see (and he who studies it most profoundly will see most clearly) that whatever of abundance, of intelligence, or of integrity, whatever of character at home or of renown abroad, she may possess, all has been evolved from the enlightened and, at least, partially Christianized mind, not of a few, but of the great masses, of her people. They are not the result of outward riches or art brought around it or laminated over it, but of an awakened inward force, working energetically outwards, and fashioning the most intractable circumstances to the dominion of its own desires and resolves; and this force has been awakened and its unspent energies replenished, more than from all things else, by her common schools.

When we witness the mighty achievements of art,— the locomotive, taking up its burden of a hundred tons, and transporting it for hundreds of miles between the rising and the setting sun; the steamboat, cleaving its rapid way, triumphant over wind and tide; the power-loom, yielding products of greater richness and abundance in a single day than all the inhabitants of Tyre could have manufactured in years; the printing-press, which could have replaced the Alexandrian Library within a week after it was burnt; the lightning, not only domesticated in the laboratories of the useful arts, but employed as a messenger between distant cities; and galleries of beautiful paintings, quickened into life by the sunbeams,— when we see all these marvels of power and of celerity, we are prone to conclude that it is to them we are indebted for the increase of our wealth and for the progress of our society. But were there any statistics to show the aggregate value of all the thrifty and gainful habits of the people at large, the greater productiveness of the educated than of the brutified laborer, the increased power of the intelligent hand, and the broad survey and deep intuition of the intelligent eye; could we see a ledger account of the profits which come from forethought, order, and system as they preside

over all our farms, in all our workshops, and emphatically in all the labors of our households,— we should then know how rapidly their gathered units swell into millions upon millions. The skill that strikes the nail's head instead of the fingers' ends, the care that mends a fence and saves a cornfield, that drives a horseshoe nail and secures both rider and horse, that extinguishes a light and saves a house, the prudence that cuts the coat according to the cloth, that lays by something for a rainy day and that postpones marriage until reasonably sure of a livelihood, the forethought that sees the end from the beginning, and reaches it by the direct route of an hour instead of the circuitous gropings of a day, the exact remembrance impressed upon childhood to do the errand as it was bidden, and, more than all, the economy of virtue over vice, of restrained over pampered desires,— these things are not set down in the works on political economy; but they have far more to do with the wealth of nations than any laws which aim to regulate the balance of trade, or any speculations on capital and labor, or any of the great achievements of art. That vast variety of ways in which an intelligent people surpass a stupid one, and an exemplary people an immoral one, has infinitely more to do with the well-being of a nation than soil or climate, or even than government itself, excepting so far as government may prove to be the patron of intelligence and virtue.

From her earliest colonial history the policy of Massachusetts has been to develop the minds of all her people, and to imbue them with the principles of duty. To do this work most effectually, she has begun it with the young. If she would continue to mount higher and higher toward the summit of prosperity, she must continue the means by which her present elevation has been gained. In doing this, she will not only exercise the noblest prerogative of government, but will cooperate with the Almighty in one of his sublimest works.

Horace Mann's greatest services to education must be sought in the field of institutions, organization, administration, legislation, and public opinion. He was a great constructive pedagogist, a wise educational statesman, an eloquent tribune of the common school. He called upon the people of all classes, as with the voice of a herald, to raise their estimate of public instruction, and to provide better facilities by which it could be furnished. He devised or

adopted new educational agencies, and persuaded the people to use them. He organized public opinion, and influenced the action of legislatures. He gave men higher ideas of the work and character of the teacher at the same time that he taught the teacher to magnify his office. He heightened the popular estimate of the instruments that are conducive and necessary to the existence of good schools. He elevated men's ideas of the value of ethical training, and made valuable suggestions looking to its prosecution. But his great theme was the relation of intellectual and moral knowledge to human well-being, individual and social. Here his faith never faltered, his ardor never cooled. In no other name did he trust for the safety of society. A confirmed rationalist, he looked with supreme confidence to the healing power of popular intelligence and virtue. In his successive reports and addresses he set forth his faith, and the grounds of it, with wonderful force of statement and fertility of illustration. To him the old theme was ever new and ever fascinating. He poured into the body politic a large measure of his own lofty faith, his great unselfishness, his burning enthusiasm. He believed in the democratizing movement of modern times, and preached the perfectibility of man. It was in this way that, as Mr. Parker said, he took up the common schools of Massachusetts in his arms and blessed them. No doubt he committed the mistake that rationalists are always prone to commit,—that of overestimating the power of intelligence as a means to virtue. Still, it is perfectly obvious that a generous measure of such confidence is a prerequisite to the efficiency and even to the existence of public schools, and that it forms the very foundation of democratic government.—*Hinsdale.*

Horace Mann was the great leader in the Common School Revival in New England in the middle of the present century. The Massachusetts State Board of Education was created in 1837, through the efforts of James G. Carter and others; and Mann became its first secretary, holding the position until 1848. His influence upon educational thought and sentiment, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the country, was unparalleled. To him more, perhaps, than to any other, our common-school system is indebted for its remarkable development during the last half of the century. His twelve annual reports, each devoted to distinct subjects, are classics in our educational literature. The tenth report, that of 1846, is given in the present leaflet, almost in its entirety. A brief outline of the twelve reports may be found in Hinsdale's little volume upon Mann, chap. vii; also in Dr. William T. Harris's address at the Mann Centennial, printed in the Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1895–96, vol. i. All of these reports are printed in full in the Life and Works of Horace Mann, 5 vols.; and here also (vol. ii.) may be found the seven lectures delivered by Mann in successive years before the various county conventions of the State. The third and fifth of these lectures, "The Necessity of Education in a Republican Government" and "An

Historical View of Education, showing its Dignity and its Degradation," are especially commended to the student as re-enforcing the considerations urged in the report reprinted in the present leaflet.

A thorough life of Horace Mann, by Mrs. Mann, occupies the first of the five volumes of the Life and Works; and there is an admirable brief biography by Prof. B. A. Hinsdale in the "Great Educators" series, which contains, in an appendix, an excellent bibliography. The survey of the period, in this little volume, is most discriminating; and Dr. Hinsdale performs a distinct service in directing attention so intelligently and justly to Mann's forerunners, and especially to James G. Carter, "the one man who did more to cast up a highway for Horace Mann than any other." "To him," says Henry Barnard, "more than to any other one person belongs the credit of having first attracted the attention of the leading minds of Massachusetts to the necessity of immediate and thorough improvement in the system of free or public schools." George B. Emerson rightly bestowed upon him the title of "Father of Normal Schools"; and Dr. Hinsdale pronounces his *Letters on the Free Schools of New England* "incomparably the best existing mirror of education in New England in the first quarter of this century." This, and his *Essays upon Popular Education*, the closing essay of which outlines the modern Normal School, should be read by the student who would understand the situation into which Horace Mann entered, and by the general student of the history of education in America in the nineteenth century.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

200

Old South Leaflets.

No. 110.

The Romance of New England History.

By RUFUS CHOATE.

The Importance of Illustrating New England History by a Series of Romances like the Waverley Novels. An Address delivered at Salem, 1833.

The history of the United States, from the planting of the several colonies out of which they have sprung to the end of the War of the Revolution, is now as amply written, as accessible, and as authentic, as any other portion of the history of the world, and incomparably more so than an equal portion of the history of the origin and first ages of any other nation that ever existed. But there is one thing more which every lover of his country and every lover of literature would wish done for our early history. He would wish to see such a genius as Walter Scott (*exoriatur aliquis*), or, rather, a thousand such as he, undertake in earnest to illustrate that early history by a series of romantic compositions "in prose or rhyme," like the Waverley Novels, the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," and the "Lady of the Lake," the scenes of which should be laid in North America somewhere in the time before the Revolution, and the incidents and characters of which should be selected from the records and traditions of that, our heroic age. He would wish at length to hear such a genius mingling the tones of a ravishing national minstrelsy with the grave narrative, instructive reflections, and chastened feelings of Marshall, Pitkin, Holmes, and Ramsay. He would wish to see him giving to the natural scenery of the New World and to the celebrated personages and grand incidents of its earlier annals the same kind and degree of interest which Scott has given to the High-

lands, to the Reformation, the Crusades, to Richard, the Lion-hearted, and to Louis XI. He would wish to see him clear away the obscurity which two centuries have been collecting over it, and unroll a vast, comprehensive, and vivid panorama of our old New England lifetimes, from its sublimest moments to its minutest manners. He would wish to see him begin with the landing of the Pilgrims, and pass down to the War of Independence, from one epoch and one generation to another, like Old Mortality among the graves of the unforgotten faithful, wiping the dust from the urns of our fathers, gathering up whatever of illustrious achievement, of heroic suffering, of unwavering faith, their history commemorates, and weaving it all into an immortal and noble national literature,— pouring over the whole time, its incidents, its actors, its customs, its opinions, its moods of feeling, the brilliant illustration, the unfading glories, which the fictions of genius alone can give to the realities of life.

For our lawyers, politicians, and for most purposes of mere utility, business, and intellect, our history now perhaps unfolds a sufficiently "ample page." But I confess I should love to see it assume a form in which it should speak directly to the heart and affections and imagination of the whole people. I should love to see by the side of these formidable records of dates and catalogues of British governors and provincial acts of Assembly,— these registers of the settlement of towns and the planting of churches and convocation of synods and drawing up of platforms,— by the side of these austere and simply severe narratives of Indian wars, English usurpations, French intrigues, Colonial risings, and American independence,— I should love to see by the side of these great and good books about a thousand neat duodecimos of the size of "Ivanhoe," "Kenilworth," and "Marmion," all full of pictures of our natural beauty and grandeur, the still richer pictures of our society and manners, the lights and shadows of our life, full of touching incidents, generous sentiments, just thoughts, beaming images, such as are scattered over everything which Scott has written, as thick as stars on the brow of night, and give to everything he has written that imperishable, strange charm, which will be on it and embalm it forever. . . .

I venture to maintain, first, that such works as these would possess a very high historical value. They would be valuable for the light they would shed upon the first one hundred and

fifty years of our Colonial existence. They would be valuable as helps to history, as contributions to history, as real and authoritative documents of history. They would be valuable for the same reason that the other more formal and graver records of our history are so, if not quite in the same degree.

To make this out, it may be necessary to pause a moment and analyze these celebrated writings, and inquire what they contain and how they are made up. It is so easy to read Scott's Novels that we are apt to forget with how much labor he prepared himself to *write* them. We are imposed on, startled perhaps, by the words novel and poem. We forget that any one of them is not merely a brilliant and delightful romance, but a deep, well-considered, and instructive essay on the manners, customs, and political condition of England or Scotland at the particular period to which it refers. Such is the remark of a foreign critic of consummate taste and learning, and it is certainly just. Let us reverently attempt to unfold the process — to indicate the course of research and reflection — by which they are perfected, and thus to detect the secret not so much of their extraordinary power and popularity as of their historical value.

He selects, then, I suppose (I write of him as living; for, though dead, he still speaks to the whole reading population of the world), first, the country in which he will lay the scenes of his action,— Scotland, perhaps, or merry England, or the beautiful France. He marks off the portions of that country within which the leading incidents shall be transacted, as a conjurer draws the charmed circle with his wand on the floor of the Cave of Magic. Then he studies the topography of the region,— its scenery, its giant mountains, its lakes, glens, forests, falls of water — as minutely as Malté Brun or Humboldt; but choosing out with a poet's eye and retaining with a poet's recollection the grand, picturesque, and graceful points of the whole transcendent landscape. Then he goes on to collect and treasure up the artificial, civil, historical features of the country. He explores its antiquities, becomes minutely familiar with every city and castle and cathedral which still stands and with the grander ruins of all which have fallen,— familiar with every relic and trace of man and art, down even to the broken cistern which the Catholic charity of a former age had hewn out by the wayside for the pilgrim to drink in. He gathers up all the traditions and legendary history of the

place, every story of "hopeless love or glory won," with the time, the spot, the circumstances, as particularly and as fondly as if he had lived there a thousand years. He selects the age to which his narrative shall refer, perhaps that of Richard, or Elizabeth, or Charles the Second, or of the rebellion of 1745; and forthwith engages in a deep and discursive study of its authentic history and biography, its domestic and foreign politics, the state of parties, the character and singularities of the reigning king and his court and of the prominent personages of the day, its religious condition, the wars, revolts, revolutions, and great popular movements, all the predominant objects of interest and excitement, and all which made up the public and out-of-door life and history of that particular generation. He goes deeper still: the state of society, the manners, customs, and employments of the people, their dress, their arms and armor, their amusements, their entire indoor and domestic life, the rank and accomplishments of the sexes respectively, their relations to each other, the extent of their popular and higher education, their opinions, superstitions, morals, jurisprudence, and police,—all these he investigates as earnestly as if he were nothing but an antiquarian, but with the liberal, enlightened, and tolerant curiosity of a scholar, philosopher, philanthropist, who holds that man is not only the most proper, but most delightful study of man. Thus thoroughly furnished, he chooses an affecting incident, real or imaginary, for his groundwork, and rears upon it a composition which the mere novel-reader will admire for its absorbing narrative and catastrophe; the critic for its elegant style, dazzling poetry, and elaborate art; the student of human nature for its keen and shrewd views of man, "for each change of many-colored life he draws"; the student of history for its penetrating development and its splendid, exact, and comprehensive illustration of the spirit of one of the marked ages of the world. And this is a Waverley Novel!

Perhaps I am now prepared to restate and maintain the general position which I have taken,—that a series of North American or New England Waverley Novels would be eminently valuable auxiliaries to the authoritative written history of New England and of North America.

In the first place, they would embody, and thus would fix deep in the general mind and memory of the whole people, a

vast amount of positive information quite as authentic and valuable and curious as that which makes up the matter of professed history, but which the mere historian does not and cannot furnish. They would thus be not substitutes for history, but supplements to it. Let us dwell upon this consideration for a moment. It is wonderful, when you think closely on it, how little of all which we should love to know and ought to know about a former period and generation a really standard history tells us. From the very nature of that kind of composition it must be so. Its appropriate and exclusive topics are a few prominent, engrossing, and showy incidents,— wars, conquests, revolutions, changes of dynasties, battles, and sieges,— the exterior and palpable manifestations of the workings of the stormy and occasional passions of men moving in large masses on the high places of the world. These topics it treats instructively and eloquently. But what an inadequate conception does such a book give you of the time, the country, and the people to which it relates! What a meagre, cold, and unengaging outline does it trace, and how utterly deficient in minute, precise, and circumstantial and satisfactory information! How little does it tell you of the condition and character of the great body of the people,— their occupations, their arts and customs, their joys and sorrows! how little of the origin, state, and progress of opinions and of the spirit of the age! How misty, indistinct, and tantalizing are the glimpses you gain of that old, fair, wonderful creation which you long to explore! It is like a vast landscape painting in which nothing is represented but the cloven summit and grand sweep of the mountain, a portion of the sounding shore of the illimitable sea, the dim, distant course of a valley, traversed by the father of rivers two thousand miles in length, and which has no place for the enclosed corn-field, the flocks upon a thousand hills, the cheerful country-seat, the village spires, the churchyard, the vintage, the harvest-home, the dances of peasants, and the "cotter's Saturday night."

Now the use, one use, of such romances as Scott's is to supply these deficiencies of history. Their leading object, perhaps, may be to tell an interesting story with some embellishments of poetry and eloquence and fine writing and mighty dialogue. But the plan on which they are composed requires that they should interweave into their main design a

near, distinct, and accurate, but magnified and ornamental view of the times, people, and country to which that story goes back. They are, as it were, telescope, microscope and kaleidoscope all in one, if the laws of optics permit such an illustration. They give you the natural scenery of that country in a succession of landscapes fresh and splendid as any in the whole compass of literature, yet as topographically accurate as you will find in any geography or book of travels. They cause a crowded but exact and express image of the age and society of which they treat to pass before you as you see Moscow or Jerusalem or Mexico in a showman's box. They introduce genuine specimens,—real living men and women of every class and calling in society, as it was then constituted, and make them talk and act in character. You see their dress, their armor, and their weapons of war. You sit at their tables, you sleep under their roof-tree, you fish, hunt, and fowl with them. You follow them to their employments in field, forest, and workshop, you travel their roads, cross their rivers, worship with them at church, pledge them at the feast, and hear their war-cry in battle, and the coronach which announces and laments their fall. Time and space are thus annihilated by the power of genius. Instead of reading about a past age, you live in it. Instead of looking through a glass darkly at vast bodies in the distance,—at the separate, solitary glories of a sky beyond your reach,—wings as of the morning are given you: you ascend to that sky, and gaze on their unveiled present glories. It is as if you were placed in the streets of a city buried eighteen hundred years ago by the lava of a volcano, and saw it suddenly and completely disinterred, and its whole, various population raised in a moment to life in the same attitudes, clothed upon with the same bodies, wearing the same dresses, engaged in the same occupations, and warmed by the same passions, in which they perished! If would carry me too far to illustrate these thoughts by minute references to all Scott's poetry and romances, or to attempt to assort the particulars and sum up the aggregate of the real historical information for which we are indebted to that poetry and those romances. Go back, however, at random, to the age of Richard of the Lion Heart, the close of the twelfth century, the era of chivalry, the Crusades, and almost of Magna Charta. Read of it first in the acute and elegant Hume and the laborious Lingard; and then

open the splendid romance of "Ivanhoe," and see not which most interests you, but which relates most vividly, most minutely, and most completely, the authentic history of the England of that troubled yet glorious day. The character and peculiarities of the chivalrous Richard; his physical strength; his old English good-nature and companionable and convivial qualities and practices; his romantic love of adventure and peril and of the rapture of battle (*certaminis gaudia*), relieved and softened by his taste for troubadour music and song; the cold, jealous, timid temper of his brother John, at once an ambitious usurper and an unprincipled voluptuary; the intriguing politics of his court; his agency in procuring Richard's long imprisonment in Germany, and his sudden start of terror on hearing of his escape and return to England to claim his throne; the separation of the English people of that era into two great distinct and strongly marked races, the Saxon and the Norman; the characteristic traits and employments of each; the relations they sustained to each other; their mutual fear, hatred, and suspicion; the merry lives of Robin Hood and his archers in the forest; the pride and licentiousness of the bold Norman barons, and the barbaric magnificence of their castles, equipage, and personal decoration; the contrasted poverty and dignified sorrow of the fallen Saxon chiefs; the institutions and rites of a still gorgeous but waning chivalry; the skilful organization, subtle policy, and imposing exterior of the order of the Templars; the pride, pomp, and circumstance of the gilded and sounding era of the Crusades,— these topics, this information, not the well-feigned fortunes of Isaac, Rebecca, Athelstane, Wilfred, give to the surpassing poetry and painting of this unequalled romance a permanent and recognized historical value, and entitle it to a place upon the same shelf with the more exclusive and pretending teachers of English history.

Let me remind you that Scott is not the only writer of romance who has made his fiction the vehicle of authentic and useful information concerning the past, and thus earned the praise of a great historian. Let me remind you of another instance,— the most splendid in literature. The Iliad and Odyssey of Homer,— what are they but great Waverley Novels? And yet what were our knowledge of the first four hundred years of Grecian history without them? Herodotus, the father of history, devotes about twenty-five duodecimo

lines to the subject of the Trojan Wanderer; and, without meaning any disrespect to so revered a name, so truly valuable a writer, I must say that this part of his narrative is just about as interesting and instructive as an account in a Castine newspaper that in a late, dark night a schooner from Eastport got upon Mt. Desert Rock, partly bilged, but that no lives were lost, and there was no insurance. Unroll, now, by the side of this the magnificent cartoons on which Homer has painted the heroic age of the bright clime of battle and of song! Abstracting your attention for a moment from the beauty and grandeur and consummate art of these compositions, just study them for the information they embody. We all know that critics have deduced the rules of epic poetry from these inspired models, and Horace tells us that they are better teachers of morality than the Stoic doctors, Chrysippus and Crates. But what else may you learn from them? The ancient geography of Greece; the number, names, localities, and real or legendary history of its tribes; the condition of its arts, trades, agriculture, navigation, and civil policy; its military and maritime resources; its manners and customs; its religious opinions and observances and mythology and festivals,—this is the information for which we are indebted to an old, wandering, blind harper,—just such another as he who sang the "Lay of the Last Minstrel" to the ladies of Newark Castle. . . .

It is time now to turn to our early history, and consider more directly in what way and to what extent *our* Iliad and Odyssey, and "Ivanhoe" and "Kenilworth," when they come to be written, will help to illustrate and to complete and to give attraction to that history. Select, then, for this purpose, almost at random, any memorable event or strongly marked period in our annals. King Philip's War is as good an illustration as at this moment occurs to me. What do our historians tell us of that war? and of New England during that war? You will answer substantially this: It was a war excited by Philip — a bold, crafty, and perfidious Indian chief dwelling at Bristol in Rhode Island — for the purpose of extirpating or expelling the English colonists of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. It began in 1675 by an attack on the people of Swanzey, as they were returning on Sunday from meeting. It ended in August, 1676, at Mount Hope, by the death of Philip and the annihilation of his tribe. In the course of these two years he had succeeded in drawing into

his designs perhaps fifteen or twenty communities of Indians, and had at one time and another perhaps eight or ten thousand men in arms.

The scenes of the war shifted successively from Narragansett Bay to the northern line of Massachusetts in the valley of the Connecticut River. But there was safety nowhere. There was scarcely a family of which a husband, a son, a brother, had not fallen. The land was filled with mourning. Six hundred dwelling-houses were burned with fire. Six hundred armed young men and middle-aged fell in battle, as many others, including women and children, were carried away into that captivity so full of horrors to a New England imagination. The culture of the earth was interrupted. The prayers, labors, and sufferings of half a century were nearly forever frustrated.

Such is about the whole of what history records, or, rather, of what the great body of our well-educated readers know of the New England of 1675, and of the severest and most interesting crisis through which, in any epoch, the colony was called to pass. Now, I say, commit this subject, King Philip's War, to Walter Scott, the poet, or the novelist, and you would see it wrought up and expanded into a series of pictures of the New England of that era, so full, so vivid, so true, so instructive, so moving, that they would grave themselves upon the memory and dwell in the hearts of our whole people forever. How he would do this, precisely what kinds of novels and poems he would write, . . . it would be presumptuous in me to venture fully to explain. Some imperfect and modest conjectures upon this point, however, I hope you will excuse.

In the first place, he would collect and display a great many particulars of positive information concerning these old times, either not contained at all in our popular histories or not in a form to fix the attention of the general reader. He would spread out before you the external aspects and scenery of that New England, and contrast them with those which our eyes are permitted to see, but which our fathers died without beholding. And what a contrast! The grand natural outline and features of the country were indeed the same then as now, and are so yesterday, to-day, and always. The same waves dashed high upon the same "stern and rock-bound coast"; the same rivers poured their sweet and cheerful tides into the same broad bay; the same ascending succession of geological formations — the narrow sandy belt of seashore and marsh and

river intervals, the wider level of upland, the green or rocky hill, the mountain bearing its gray summit to the skies — met the eye then as now; the same east wind chilled the lingering spring; the same fleecy clouds, bland south-west wind, yellow and crimson leaf, and insidious disease waited upon the coming in of autumn. But how was it in that day with those more characteristic, changeful, and interesting aspects which man gives to a country? These ripened fruits of two hundred years of labor and liberty; these populous towns; this refined and affluent society; these gardens, orchards, and corn-fields; these manufactories and merchant-ships,— where were they then? The whole Colonial population of New England, including Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, New Haven, Maine, New Hampshire, at the breaking out of that war has been variously estimated at from 40,000 to 120,000. I suppose that 80,000 may be a fair average of these estimates,— a little less than the present population of the single county of Essex. They were planted along the coast from the mouth of the Kennebec to New Haven, upon a strip of country of a medium width, inwards from the sea, of forty or fifty miles, a great deal of which, however, was still wholly unreclaimed to cultivation, and much of it still occupied by its original and native owners. This belt of seacoast — for it was no more than that — was the New England of 1675. Within this belt, and up the interval land of some of the rivers — the Merrimac, the Charles, the Connecticut — which passed down through it to the sea, a few settlements had been thrown forward: but, as a general fact, the whole vast interior to the line of New York, Vermont, and lower Canada, including in Massachusetts a part of the counties of Essex, Middlesex, Worcester, Old Hampshire, Berkshire, was a primeval wilderness, beneath whose ancient shadow a score of Indian tribes maintained their fires of war and council, and observed the rites of that bloody and horrible Paganism which formed their only religion.

On this narrow border were stretched along the low wooden houses, with their wooden chimneys; the patches of Indian corn, crossed and enclosed by the standing forest; the smooth-shaven meadow and salt marsh; the rocky pasture of horses, sheep, and neat cattle; the fish-flakes, lumber-yards, the fishing boats and coasting shallops; West India and Wine Islands merchant-ships; the meeting-houses, wind-mills, and small stockade forts, which made up the human, artificial, and

visible exterior of the New England of that era. Altogether, the whole scene, in its natural and in its cultivated elements, was in exact keeping with the condition and character and prospects of that generation of our ancestors. It was the dwelling-place of the Pilgrims and of the children of the Pilgrims. There lay — covered over, as it were, partially sheltered, yet not wholly out of danger, like the sowing of a winter grain — the germs of this day's exceeding glory, beauty, and strength. There rose, plain, massive, and deep-set, the basement stories of our religious, civil, and literary institutions, beaten against and raged around by many a tempest and many a flood, yet not falling; for their foundation was a rock. Fifty years of continual emigration from England and of general peace and general health had swelled the handful of men who came passengers in the "Mayflower" to Plymouth and in the "Abigail" to Salem and in the "Arbella" to Boston into an infant people. Independence of the mother country had hardly yet entered the waking or sleeping dreams of any man; but, as against all the world besides, they had begun to utter the language, put on the habits, and assume the port, of a nascent and asserted sovereignty and national existence. Some portion of the great work which they were sent hither to do they had already done. They had constructed a republican, representative government. They had made provision for the mental and moral culture of the rising nation. Something of the growth of a half-century of industry — "immature buds, blossoms fallen from the tree, and green fruit" — were beginning to gladden the natural and the moral prospect. Still, the general aspect of the scenery of that day, even if surveyed from one of those eminences which now rise in so much beauty around Boston, would have seemed to the senses and imagination of a beholder wild, austere, and uninviting. The dreams of some of the sanguine early settlers were by this time finished. It had been discovered by this time that our soil contained neither gold nor silver; and that, although we could purchase very good wine at Fayal or Madeira, with the proceeds of the fish we sold at Bilboa, we were not likely to quite rival Hungary, as Master Grave, the engineer, in 1629, thought we should, in the domestic article. The single damask rose grew wild by the walls, as Mr. Higginson says it did in his time; but all felt by the year 1675 that it was, on the whole, a somewhat ungenial heaven beneath which their lot was cast, yielding nothing to luxury and noth-

ing to idleness, but yet holding out to faith, to patience and labor, freedom and public and private virtue, the promise of a latter day far off of glory, honor, and enjoyment. Everything around you spoke audibly to the senses and imagination of toil and privation, of wearisome days and sleepless nights, of serious aims, grave duties, and hope deferred without making the heart sick. You looked upon the first and hardest conflicts of civilized man with unreclaimed nature and uncivilized man. You saw all around you the blended antagonist manifestations and insignia of a divided empire. Indian wigwams and the one thousand houses of Boston sent up their smoke into the same sky. Indian canoes and the fishing and coasting craft and merchantmen, loading for Spain and Africa and the West Indies, floated upon the same waters. English grain and grasses grew among the blackened stumps of the newly fallen forest. Men went armed to their fields, to meeting, and to bring home their brides from their father's house where they had married them. It was like the contest of winter and spring described by Thomson, or like that of the good and evil principle of the Oriental superstitions; and it might at first seem doubtful which would triumph. But, when you contemplated the prospect a little more closely,— when you saw what costly and dear pledges the Pilgrims had already given to posterity and the new world, when you saw the fixtures which they had settled into and incorporated with its soil, the brick college at Cambridge, and the meeting-houses sending up their spires from every clearing, when you surveyed the unostentatious but permanent and vast improvements which fifty years had traced upon the face of that stern and wild land and garnered up in its bosom, when you looked steadfastly into the countenances of those men and read there that expression of calm resolve, high hope, and fixed faith, when you heard their prayers for that once pleasant England as for a land they no longer desired to see, for the new world, now not merely the scene of their duties, but the home of their heart's adoption,— you would no longer doubt that, though the next half-century should be, as it proved, a long, bloody warfare, though the mother country should leave them, as she did, to contend single-handed with Indians, French, and an unpropitious soil and sky, though acts of navigation and boards of trade should restrain their enterprise and rob it of its rewards, that their triumph was still certain, and a later genera-

tion would partake of its fruits, and be encompassed about by its glory. A thousand instructive particulars would be collected by such an antiquarian as the author of "Old Mortality," serving to illustrate the employments, customs, and character of this portion of our ancestors, and embodied in such a form as to become permanently a part of the current knowledge of an educated people. The industry of New England in 1675 had taken almost all the great leading directions in which it afterwards exerted itself with splendid success. There were then nearly five hundred fishing vessels, large and small, in the four colonies. The export of fish to the north of Spain, to Fayal and Madeira, and of lumber, pipe-staves, provisions, naval stores, and neat cattle to the West Indies, and the import of wines and West India goods employed from one to two hundred vessels more, of a larger rate, built and owned in New England. The principal import of British goods was to Boston, whence they were shipped coastwise to Maine, Hartford, and New Haven. Linen, woollen, and cotton cloth, glass, and salt, to some extent, were manufactured in Massachusetts. The flax was all raised here, the wool chiefly. The cotton was imported. The equality of fortunes was remarkable even for that age of simple habits and general industry and morality. There were only fifteen or twenty merchants worth five hundred pounds each, and there were no beggars. The most showy mansion contained no more than twenty rooms: but the meanest cottage had at least two stories,—a remarkable improvement since 1629, when the house of the Lady Moody, a person of great consideration in Salem, is said to have been only nine feet high, with a wooden chimney in the centre. Governor Winthrop says in his Journal that he spent in the years he was governor five hundred pounds per annum, of which two hundred pounds — not seven hundred dollars — would have maintained him in a private condition. There were no musicians by trade. A dancing-school was attempted, but failed. But a fencing-school in Boston succeeded eminently. We all know that fencing, without foils or tuition-fees, was the daily and nightly exercise of the youth and manhood of the colonies for half the first century of their existence. It is strikingly characteristic of our fathers of that day of labor, temperate habits, and austere general morality, that a synod convened in 1679 to inquire what crying sin of practice or opinion had brought down the judgment of

God on the colonies ascribed it very much to the intemperate and luxurious habits of what they deemed a backsliding and downward age. Hubbard reckons among the moral causes of that war the pride, intemperance, and worldly-mindedness of the people; and another writer of that day denounces with most lachrymose eloquence the increasing importations of wine, threatening the Ararat of the Pilgrims with a new kind of deluge. . . .

There are two or three subjects, among a thousand others of a different character, connected with the history of New England in that era which deserve and would reward the fullest illustration which learning and genius and philosophy could bestow. They have been treated copiously and ably; but I am sure that whoso creates the romantic literature of the country will be found to have placed them in new lights, and to have made them for the first time familiar, intelligible, and interesting to the mass of the reading community.

Let me instance as one of these the old Puritan character. In every view of it, it was an extraordinary mental and moral phenomenon. The countless influences which have been acting on man ever since his creation — the countless variety of condition and circumstances of climate, of government, of religion, and of social systems in which he has lived — never produced such a specimen of character as this before, and never will do so again. It was developed, disciplined, and perfected for a particular day and a particular duty. When that day was ended and that duty done, it was dissolved again into its elements and disappeared among the common forms of humanity apart from which it had acted and suffered, above which it had towered, yet out of which it had been by a long process elaborated. The human influences which combined to form the Puritan character from the general mind of England, which set this sect apart from all the rest of the community, and stamped upon it a system of manners, a style of dress and salutation and phraseology, a distinct, entire scheme of opinions upon religion, government, morality, and human life, marking it off from the crowds about it, as the fabled waters of the classical fountain passed underneath the sea, unmingled, unchanged in taste or color,— these things are matters of popular history, and I need not enumerate or weigh them. What was the final end for which the Puritans were raised up, we, also, in some part all know. All things here in

New England proclaim it. The works which they did, these testify of them and of the objects and reality of their mission, and they are inscribed upon all the sides of our religious, political, and literary edifices, legibly and imperishably.

But while we appreciate what the Puritans have done, and recognize the divine wisdom and purposes in raising them up to do it, something is wanting yet to give to their character and fortunes a warm, quick interest, a charm for the feelings and imagination, an abiding-place in the heart and memory and affections of all the generations of the people to whom they bequeathed these representative governments and this undefiled religion. It is time that literature and the arts should at least co-operate with history. Themes more inspiring or more instructive were never sung by old or modern bards in hall or bower. The whole history of the Puritans — of that portion which remained in England and plucked Charles from his throne and buried crown and mitre beneath the foundations of the Commonwealth, and of that other not less noble portion which came out hither from England and founded a freer, fairer, and more enduring Commonwealth, all the leading traits of their religious, intellectual, and active character, their theological doctrines, their superstitions, their notions of the divine government and economy, and of the place they filled in it, everything about them, every thing which befell them — was out of the ordinary course of life; and he who would adequately record their fortunes, display their peculiarities, and decide upon their pretensions must, like the writer of the Pentateuch, put in requisition alternately music, poetry, eloquence, and history, and speak by turns to the senses, the fancy, and the reason of the world.

They were persecuted for embracing a purer Protestantism than the Episcopacy of England in the age of Elizabeth. Instead of ceasing to be Protestants, persecution made them republicans also. They were nicknamed "Puritans" by their enemies. Then afterward they became a distinct, solitary caste, — among, but not of, the people of England. They were flattered, they were tempted, they were shut up in prison, they were baptized with the fire of martyrdom. Solicitation, violence, were alike unavailing, except to consolidate their energies, perfect their virtues, and mortify their human affections, — to raise their thoughts from the kingdoms and kings of this world and the glory of them to the contemplation of

that surpassing glory which is to be revealed. Some of them at length — not so much because these many years of persecution had wearied or disheartened them as because they saw in it an intimation of the will of God — sought the freedom which there they found not on the bleak seashore and beneath the dark pine forest of New England. History, fiction, literature, does not record an incident of such moral sublimity as this. Others, like Æneas, have fled from the city of their fathers after the victor has entered and fired it. But the country they left was peaceful, cultivated, tasteful, merry England. The asylum they sought was upon the very outside of the world. Others have traversed seas as wide for fame or gold. Not so the Puritans.

> "Nor lure of conquest's meteor beam,
> Nor dazzling mines of fancy's dream,
> Nor wild adventure's love to roam
> Brought from their fathers' ancient home
> O'er the wide sea the Pilgrim host."

It was fit that the founders of our race should have been such men,— that they should have so labored and so suffered, that their tried and strenuous virtues should stand out in such prominence and grandeur. It will be well for us when their story shall have grown "familiar as a household word," when it shall make even your children's bosoms glow and their eyes glisten in the ballad and nursery-tale, and give pathos and elevation to our whole higher national minstrelsy.

There is another subject connected with our early history eminently adapted to the nature and purposes of romantic literature, and worthy to be illustrated by such a literature; that is, the condition, prospects, and fate of the New England tribes of Indians at the epoch of Philip's War. It has sometimes been remarked as a matter of reproach to a community that it has suffered its benefactors to perish of want, and then erected statues to their memory. The crime does not lie in erecting the statue, but in having suffered the departed good and great, whom it commemorates, to perish. It has been our lot in the appointments of Providence to be, innocently or criminally, instruments in sweeping from the earth one of the primitive families of man. We build our houses upon their graves. Our cattle feed upon the hills from which they cast their last look upon the land, pleasant to them as it is now pleasant to us, in which through an immemorial antiquity

their generations had been dwelling. The least we can do for them, for science and letters, is to preserve their history. This we have done. We have explored their antiquities, studied and written their language and deduced its grammar, recorded their traditions, traced their wanderings, and embodied in one form or another their customs, their employments, their superstitions, and their religious belief. But there is in this connection one thing which, perhaps, poetry and romance can alone do, or can best do. It is to go back to the epoch of this war, for example; paint vividly and affectingly the condition of the tribes which then wandered over, rather than occupied, the boundless wilderness extending from the margin of seacoast covered by the colonists to the line of New York and Canada. The history of man, like the roll of the Prophet, is full, within and without, of mourning, lamentation, and woe; but I do not know that in all that history there is a situation of such mournful interest as this.

The terrible truth had at length flashed upon the Indian chief that the presence of civilization, even of humane, peaceful, and moral civilization, was incompatible with the existence of Indians. He comprehended at length the tremendous power which knowledge, arts, law, government, confer upon social man. He looked in vain to the physical energies, the desperate, random, uncombined, and desultory exertions, the occasional individual virtues and abilities of barbarism, for an equal power to resist it. He saw the advancing population of the colonies. He saw shiploads of white men day after day coming ashore from some land beyond the sea, of which he could only know that it was over-peopled. Every day the woodman's axe sounded nearer and nearer. Every day some valuable fishing or hunting ground or corn-land or meadow passed out of the Indian possession, and was locked up forever in the mortmain grasp of an English title. What, then, where, then, was the hope of the Indian? Of the tribes far off to the East — the once terrible Tarrateens — they had no knowledge, but more dread than of the English themselves. The difficulty of communication, the diversity of languages, the want of a press, the unsocial habits and policy of all nomadic races, made alliances with the Five Nations in New York — with any considerable tribe out of New England — impracticable. Civilization, too, was pushing its prow up the Hudson even more adventurously than upon the Con-

necticut and Charles, the Merrimac, the Piscataqua and the Kennebec. They were encompassed about as by the embrace of a serpent, contracting its folds closer at every turn and struggle of its victim, and leisurely choosing its own time to crush him to death. Such were the condition and prospects of the Indians of New England at the beginning of Philip's War.

It is doubtful if that celebrated chief intended to provoke such a war, or if he ever anticipated for it a successful issue. But there is no doubt that after it had begun he threw his whole great powers into the conduct of it; that he formed and moved a confederacy of almost all the aborigines of New England to its support, that he exhausted every resource of bravery and Indian soldiership and statesmanship, that he died at last for a land and for a throne which he could not save. Our fathers called him King Philip, in jest. I would not wrong his warrior shade by comparing him with any five in six of the kings of Europe of his day or ours; and I sincerely wish that the elaborate jests and puns put forth by Hubbard and Mather upon occasion of his death were erased from the records of New England.

In the course of this decisive struggle with the colonists the Indians, some time when all human help seemed to fail, turned in anger and despair to the gods of their gloomy and peculiar worship. Beneath the shades of the forest, which had stood from the creation, at the entrance of caverns at midnight, in tempest and thunder, they shed the human blood and uttered the incantations which their superstitions prescribed, and called up the spirits of evil to blast these daring strangers who neither feared nor honored nor recognized the ancient divinities of the Indians. The spirits they had raised abandoned them. Their offering was not accepted: their fires of sacrifice were put out. The long, dreary sigh of the night-wind in the tops of the pines alone answered their misguided and erring prayers. Then they felt that their doom was sealed, and the cry, piercing, bitter, and final, of a perishing nation arose to heaven.

Let me solicit your attention to another view of this subject. I have urged thus far that our future Waverley Novels and poetry would contain a good deal of positive information which our histories do not contain,—gleanings, if you please, of what the licensed reapers have, intentionally or uninten-

tionally, let fall from their hands; and that this information would be authentic and valuable. I now add that they would have another use. They would make the information which our histories do contain more accessible and more engaging to the great body of readers, even if they made no addition to its absolute quantity. They would melt down, as it were, and stamp the heavy bullion into a convenient, universal circulating medium. They would impress the facts, the lessons of history, more deeply, and incorporate them more intimately into the general mind and heart, and current and common knowledge of the people.

All history, all records of the past, of the acts, opinions, and characters of those who have preceded us in the great procession of the generations, is full of instruction and written for instruction. Especially may we say so of our own history. But, of all which it teaches, its moral lessons are, perhaps, the most valuable. It holds up to our emulation and love great models of patriotism and virtue. It introduces us into the presence of venerated ancestors, "of whom the world was not worthy." It teaches us to appreciate and cherish this good land, these free forms of government, this pure worship of the conscience, these schools of popular learning, by reminding us through how much tribulation — not our own, but others — these best gifts of God to man have been secured to us. It corrects the cold selfishness which would regard ourselves, our day, and our generation as a separate and insulated portion of man and time; and, awakening our sympathies for those who have gone before, it makes us mindful, also, of those who are to follow, and thus binds us to our fathers and to our posterity by a lengthening and golden cord. It helps us to realize the serene and august presence and paramount claims of our country, and swells the deep and full flood of American feeling.

I say that he who writes the romance of history, as Scott has written it, shall teach these lessons and exert and diffuse these influences even better than he who confines himself to what I may call the reality of history. Much of what history relates produces no impression upon the moral sentiments or the imagination. It is truth, fact; but it is just what you do not want to know, and are none the wiser for knowing. Now he who writes the romance of history takes his choice of all its ample but incongruous material.

He accommodates the show of things to the desires and the needs of the immortal, moral nature. To vary a figure of Milton's, instead of crowding his net, as Time crowds his, with all things precious and vile,— bright gems, seaweed mixed with sand, bones of fishes,— he only dives for and brings up coral and pearl and shells golden-valved and rainbow-colored, murmuring to the ear like an Æolian harp. . . . He tells the truth, to be sure; but he does not tell the whole truth, for that would be sometimes misplaced and discordant. He tells something more than the truth, too, remembering that, though man is not of imagination all compact, he is yet, in part, a creature of imagination, and can be reached and perfected by a law of his nature in part only through the imagination. . . . The Richard of Scott in his general character and principal fortunes, in his chronology and geography, so to speak, is the Richard of history. But the reason you know him better is this: the particular situations in which you see him in "Ivanhoe" and the Crusaders, the conversations he holds, his obstreperous contest of drink and music with the holy clerk in the cell, that more glorious contest with the traitors in the wood, with the Normans in the castle, the scene in his tent in which he was so nearly assassinated, and that in Saladin's tent where he challenged him in all love and honor to do mortal battle for the possession of Jerusalem,— these are all supplied by the imagination of the writer to the imagination of the reader. Probably they all happened just as they are set forth, but you can't exactly prove it out of any book of history. They are all probable: they are exactly consistent with what we do know and can prove. But the record is lost by time and accident. They lie beyond the province of reason; but faith and imagination stretch beyond that province, and complete the shadowy and imperfect revelation. . . .

I do not know that I can better illustrate this difference between the romance and the reality of history, and in some respects the superiority of the former for teaching and impressing mere historical truth, than by going back to the ten years which immediately preceded the battle of Lexington. If idle wishes were not sinful as well as idle, that of all time past is the period in which we might all wish to have lived. Yet how meagre and unsatisfactory is the mere written history of that day! Indeed, there is hardly anything there for history. The tea was thrown overboard, to be sure, and the

"Gaspée" burned; town meetings were held, and committees of correspondence chosen; and touching appeals, of pathos and argument and eloquence unequalled, addressed to the king and people of England in behalf of their oppressed subjects and brethren of America. And when History has told you this, she is silent. You must go to Scott or evoke the still mightier Shakspere or Homer if you would truly know what that day was, what the people of that day were,— if you would share in that strong and wide excitement, see that feeling, not loud but deep, of anger and grief and conscious worth and the sense of violated rights, in that mingled and luxurious emotion of hope and apprehension with which the heart of the whole country throbbed and labored as the heart of a man. And how would Scott reveal to you the spirit of that age? He would place you in the middle of a group of citizens of Boston going home from the Old South, perhaps, or Faneuil Hall, where James Otis or Josiah Quincy or Samuel Adams had been speaking, and let you listen to their conversation. He would take you to their meeting on Sunday when the congregation stood up in prayer, and the venerable pastor adverted to the crisis and asked for strength and guidance from above to meet it. He would remark to you that varied expression which ran instantaneously over the general countenance of the assembly, and show you in that varied expression — the varied fortunes of America — the short sorrow, the long joy, the strife, the triumph, the agony, and the glory. In that congregation you might see in one seat the worn frame of a mother whose husband followed the banners of Wolfe, and fell with him on the Plains of Abraham, shuddering with apprehension lest such a life and such a death await her only son, yet striving, as became a matron of New England, for grace to make even that sacrifice. You might see old men who dragged Sir William Pepperell's cannon along the beach at Louisburg, now only regretting that they had not half so much youthful vigor left to fight their king as they then used up in fighting his enemies. You read in yonder eye of fire the energy and ardor of a statesman like John Adams, seeing clear through that day's business and beholding the bright spot beyond the gloom. You see the blood mount into that cheek of manly beauty, betraying the youthful Warren's dream of fame. But, as the pastor proceeded, and his feelings rose and his voice swelled

to its full expression, as he touched on the rights of the colonies and the injustice of the king, as his kindling imagination presented to him the scenes of coming and doubtful conflict, and he prayed that he to whom the shields of the earth belong would gird on his sword and go forth with our hosts on the day of battle, and would open their eyes to behold in every valley and in every plain, as the prophet beheld by the same illumination chariots of fire and horses of fire, you would see then all those minor shades of individual peculiarity pass away from the face of the assembly and one universal and sublime expression of religion and patriotism diffuse itself over all countenances alike, as sunshine upon a late disturbed sea.

Thus somewhat would Scott contrive to give you a perception of that indefinable yet real and operative existence,— the spirit of a strongly agitated age, of the temper and determination of a people in a state of high excitement and fermentation, not yet broken out into overt conduct, of that interval, so full of strange interest, between the acting of a dreadful thing and the first motion. . . .

In leaving this subject, I cannot help suggesting, at the hazard of being thought whimsical, that a literature of such writings as these, embodying the romance of the whole revolutionary and ante-revolutionary history of the United States, might do something to perpetuate the Union itself. . . . Poems and romances which shall be read in every parlor, by every fireside, in every school-house, behind every counter, in every printing-office, in every lawyer's office, at every weekly evening club, in all the States of this Confederacy, must do something, along with more palpable if not more powerful agents, toward moulding and fixing that final, grand, complex result,— the national character. A keen, well-instructed judge of such things said if he might write the ballads of a people he cared little who made its laws. Let me say if a hundred men of genius would extract such a body of romantic literature from our early history as Scott has extracted from the history of England and Scotland, and as Homer extracted from that of Greece, it perhaps would not be so alarming if demagogues should preach, or governors practise, or executives tolerate nullification. Such a literature would be a common property of all the States, a treasure of common ancestral recollections,— more noble and richer than our thousand million acres of public

land; and, unlike that land, it would be indivisible. It would be as the opening of a great fountain for the healing of the nations. Reminded of our fathers, we should remember that we are brethren. The exclusiveness of State pride, the narrow selfishness of a mere local policy, and the small jealousies of vulgar minds would be merged in an expanded, comprehensive, constitutional sentiment of old, family, fraternal regard. It would reassemble, as it were, the people of America in one vast congregation. It would rehearse in their hearing all things which God had done for them in the old time; it would proclaim the law once more; and then it would bid them join in that grandest and most affecting solemnity,— a national anthem of thanksgiving for the deliverance, of honor for the dead, of proud prediction for the future.

The tribes of Israel and Judah came up three times a year to the holy and beautiful city, and united in prayer and praise and sacrifice, in listening to that thrilling poetry, in swelling that matchless song, which celebrated the triumphs of their fathers by the Red Sea, at the fords of Jordan, and on the high places of the field of Barak's victory. But we have no feast of the Passover or of the Tabernacles or of the Commemoration. The States of Greece erected temples of the gods by a common contribution, and worshipped in them. They consulted the same oracle, they celebrated the same national festival, mingled their deliberations in the same Amphictyonic and subordinate assemblies, and sat together upon the same benches to hear their glorious history read aloud in the prose of Herodotus, the poetry of Homer and of Pindar. We have built no national temples but the Capitol: we consult no common oracle but the Constitution. We can meet together to celebrate no national festival. But the thousand tongues of the press — clearer far than the silver trumpet of the jubilee, louder than the voice of the herald at the games — may speak and do speak to the whole people without calling them from their homes or interrupting them in their employments. Happy if they should speak and the people should hear those things which pertain at least to their temporal and national salvation.

Rufus Choate's Works are published in two volumes, with a memoir by S. G. Brown included in the first volume, in which, also, are collected the lectures and addresses upon historical and literary themes, the political

speeches appearing in the second volume. The selection from Choate's writings published in Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature (vol. vi.) is intelligently made, the biographical sketch which accompanies it being by Albert Stickney. There is an interesting chapter upon Choate in E. P. Whipple's "Recollections." Since Choate wrote the eloquent address reprinted almost entire in the present leaflet, the sense of the opportunities and importance of historical fiction has deepened and widened to a remarkable degree. There is hardly any field of history which the novelist and romancer have not entered during the last half of the century, often with great illuminating power. Our own American history has by no means fared the worst. Historical fiction has its large department in all the large libraries, and by many of these admirable finding-lists and catalogues have been issued. It is sufficient here to refer to the Chronological Index to Historical Fiction, published by the Boston Public Library. History itself has been treated by many master hands in a more glowing, graphic, and picturesque way, fulfilling the demands made by Macaulay in his old essay on History, written in the early part of the century. Green's History of the English People is the most conspicuous illustration of this eloquent and dramatic treatment of history; but in America we also have brilliant illustrations. No student of the history of a people may neglect the study of that people's literature. Greece cannot be understood without a knowledge of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes. To know England, we must know Shakespeare and Milton. The actual use of historical subjects by the poets is most important. Many men see English history, and Roman history as well, chiefly through the eyes of Shakespeare; and they might see it through worse eyes. The prominence of American history in American poetry during the nineteenth century is noteworthy. One of the subjects set for the Old South Essays for 1900 is "Longfellow's Use of American Subjects and his Services for American History." When we have named "Hiawatha," the "Courtship of Miles Standish," "Evangeline," and the "New England Tragedies," we have indicated a large portion of the sum total of Longfellow's poetry; and scores of briefer poems touching American history and life remain to be named. The meeting devoted to the memory of Longfellow just after his death in 1882, by the Massachusetts Historical Society, of which he was a member, was noteworthy for the tributes to his distinct and great services for our history; see the Society's *Proceedings*, vol. xix. The poetry of America forms an element as important in the poetry of Whittier and Lowell, and almost as important in the works of our other American poets; while it is to our poets, from Emerson down, that we go for the noblest expressions of our patriotism and the highest calls to a noble national life.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.

Old South Leaflets.

No. 111.

Kossuth's First Speech in Faneuil Hall.

SPEECH IN FANEUIL HALL, THURSDAY EVENING, APRIL 29, 1852.

Ladies and Gentlemen,— Do me the justice to believe that I rise not with any pretension to eloquence within the Cradle of American Liberty. If I were standing upon the ruins of Prytaneum, and had to speak whence Demosthenes spoke, my tongue would refuse to obey, my words would die away upon my lips, and I would listen to the winds fraught with the dreadful realization of his unheeded prophecies. Spirit of American eloquence, frown not at my boldness that I dare abuse Shakespeare's language in Faneuil Hall! It is a strange fate, and not my choice. My tongue is fraught with a down-trodden nation's wrongs. The justice of my cause is my eloquence; but misfortune may approach the altar whence the flame arose which roused your fathers from degradation to independence. I claim my people's share in the benefit of the laws of nature and of nature's God. I will nothing add to the historical reputation of these walls; but I dare hope not to sully them by appealing to those maxims of truth the promulgation of which made often tremble these walls from the thundering cheers of freemen, roused by the clarion sound of inspired oratory.

"Cradle of American Liberty!" it is a great name; but there is something in it which saddens my heart. You should not say "American liberty." You should say "Liberty in America." Liberty should not be either American or European,— it should be just "liberty." God is God. He is neither Amer-

ica's God nor Europe's God. He is God. So shall liberty be. "American liberty" has much the sound as if you would say "American privilege." And there is the rub. Look to history, and, when your heart saddens at the fact that liberty never yet was lasting in any corner of the world and in any age, you will find the key of it in the gloomy truth that all who yet were free regarded liberty as their privilege instead of regarding it as a principle. The nature of every privilege is exclusiveness; that of a principle is communicative. Liberty is a principle; its community is its security; exclusiveness is its doom.

What is aristocracy? It is exclusive liberty; it is privilege; and aristocracy is doomed, because it is contrary to the destiny and welfare of man. Aristocracy should vanish, not in the nations, but also from amongst the nations. So long as that is not done, liberty will nowhere be lasting on earth. It is equally fatal to individuals as to nations to believe themselves beyond the reach of vicissitudes. To this proud reliance, and the isolation resulting therefrom, more victims have fallen than to oppression by immediate adversities. You have prodigiously grown by your freedom of seventy-five years; but what is seventy-five years to take for a charter of immortality? No, no, my humble tongue tells the records of eternal truth. A privilege never can be lasting. Liberty restricted to one nation never can be sure. You may say, "We are the prophets of God," but you shall not say, "God is only our God." The Jews have said so, and the pride of Jerusalem lies in the dust. Our Saviour taught all humanity to say, "Our Father in heaven"; and his Jerusalem is lasting to the end of days.

"There is a community in mankind's destiny." That was the greeting which I read on the arch of welcome on the Capitol Hill of Massachusetts. I pray to God the republic of America would weigh the eternal truth of those words, and act accordingly. Liberty in America would then be sure to the end of time. But if you say "American liberty," and take that grammar for your policy, I dare say the time will yet come when humanity will have to mourn over a new proof of the ancient truth, that without community national freedom is never sure. You should change "American liberty" into "Liberty," then liberty would be forever sure in America, and that which found a cradle in Faneuil Hall never would find a coffin through all coming days. I like not the word "cradle"

connected with the word "liberty." It has a scent of mortality. But these are vain words, I know. Though in the life of nations the spirits of future be marching in present events, visible to every reflecting mind, still those who foretell them are charged with arrogantly claiming the title of prophets, and prophecies are never believed. However, the cradle of American liberty is not only famous from the reputation of having been always the lists of the most powerful eloquence; it is still more conspicuous for having seen that eloquence attended by practical success. To understand the mystery of this rare circumstance, a man must see the people of New England and especially the people of Massachusetts.

In what I have seen of New England there are two things the evidence of which strikes the observer at every step,— prosperity and intelligence. I have seen thousands assembled, following the noble impulses of generous hearts; almost the entire population of every city, of every town, of every village where I passed, gathered around me, throwing the flowers of consolation in my thorny way. I can say I have seen the people here, and I have looked at it with a keen eye, sharpened in the school of a toilsome life. Well, I have seen not a single man bearing mark of that poverty upon himself which in old Europe strikes the eye sadly at every step. I have seen no ragged poor. I have seen not a single house bearing the appearance of desolated poverty. The cheerfulness of a comfortable condition, the result of industry, spreads over the land. One sees at a glance that the people work assiduously,— not with the depressing thought just to get from day to day, by hard toil, through the cares of a miserable life, but they work with the cheerful consciousness of substantial happiness. And the second thing which I could not fail to remark is the stamp of intelligence impressed upon the very eyes and outward appearance of the people at large. I and my companions have seen that people in the factories, in the workshops, in their houses, and in the streets, and could not fail a thousand times to think,— "How intelligent that people looks." It is to such a people that the orators of Faneuil Hall had to speak, and therein is the mystery of their success. They were not wiser than the public spirit of their audience, but they were the eloquent interpreters of the people's enlightened instinct.

No man can force the harp of his own individuality into the people's heart; but every man may play upon the cords of his

people's heart, who draws his inspiration from the people's instinct. Well, I thank God for having seen the public spirit of the people of Massachusetts bestowing its attention to the cause I plead, and pronouncing its verdict. After the spontaneous manifestations of public opinion which I have met in Massachusetts, there can be not the slightest doubt that his Excellency, the high-minded Governor of Massachusetts, when he wrote his memorable address to the Legislature, the joint committee of the Legislative Assembly, after a careful and candid consideration of the subject, not only concurring in the views of the executive government, but elucidating them in a report, the irrefutable logic and elevated statesmanship of which will forever endear the name of Hazewell to oppressed nations, and the Senate of Massachusetts adopting the resolutions proposed by the Legislative Committee, in respect to the question of national intervention,— I say the spontaneous manifestation of public opinion leaves not the slightest doubt that all these executive and legislative proceedings not only met the full approbation of the people of Massachusetts, but were, in fact, nothing else but the solemn interpretation of that public opinion of the people of Massachusetts. A spontaneous outburst of popular sentiments tells often more in a single word than all the skill of elaborate eloquence could. I have met that word. "We worship not the man, but we worship the principle," shouted out a man in Worcester, amidst the thundering cheers of a countless multitude. It was a word like those words of flame, spoken in Faneuil Hall, out of which liberty in America was born. That word is a revelation that the spirit of eternal truth and of present exigencies moves through the people's heart. That word is teeming with the destinies of America.

Would to God that, in the leading quarters, small party considerations should never prevent the due appreciation of the people's instinctive sagacity! It is with joyful consolation and heartfelt gratitude I own that of that fear I am forever relieved in respect to Massachusetts. Once more I have met the revelation of the truth that the people of Massachusetts worship principles. I have met it on the front of your capitol, in those words raised to the consolation of the oppressed world, by the constitutional authorities of Massachusetts, to the high heaven, upon an arch of triumph,— "Remember that there is a community in mankind's destiny."

I cannot express the emotion I felt when, standing on the steps of your Capitol, these words above my head, the people of Massachusetts tendered me its hand in the person of its chief magistrate. The emotion which thrilled through my heart was something like that Lazarus must have felt when the Saviour spoke to him, "Rise"; and, when I looked up with a tender tear of heartfelt gratitude in my eyes, I saw the motto of Massachusetts all along the capitol,—"We seek with the sword the mild quietness of liberty." You have proved this motto not to be an empty word. The heroic truth of it is recorded in the annals of Faneuil Hall, it is recorded on Bunker Hill, recorded in the Declaration of Independence. Having read that motto, coupled with the acknowledgment of the principle that there is a community in the destiny of all humanity, I know what answer I have to take to those millions who look with profound anxiety to America.

Gentlemen, the Mahometans say that the city of Bokhara receives not light from without, but is lustrous with its own light. I don't know much about Bokhara; but so much I know, that Boston is the sun whence radiated the light of resistance against oppression. And, from what it has been my good fortune to experience in Boston, I have full reason to believe that the sun which shone forth with such a bright lustre in the days of oppression has not lost its lustre by freedom and prosperity. Boston is the metropolis of Massachusetts, and Massachusetts has given its vote. It has given it after having, with the penetrating sagacity of its intelligence, looked attentively into the subject, and fixed with calm consideration its judgment thereabout. After having had so much to speak, it was with infinite gratification I heard myself addressed in Brookfield, Framingham, and several other places, with these words: "We know your country's history; we agree with your principles; we want no speech; just let us hear your voice, and then go on; we trust and wish you may have other things to do than speak." Thus having neither to tell my country's tale, because it is known, nor having to argue about principles, because they are agreed with, I am in the happy condition of being able to restrain myself to a few desultory remarks about the nature of the difficulties I have to contend with in other quarters, that the people of Massachusetts may see upon what ground those stand who are following a direction contrary to the distinctly pronounced opinion of Massachusetts, in relation to the cause I plead.

Give me leave to mention that, having had an opportunity to converse with leading men of the great political parties which are on the eve of an animated contest for the Presidency,— would it had been possible for me to have come to America either before that contest was engaged or after it will be decided! I came, unhappily, in a bad hour,— I availed myself of that opportunity to be informed about what are considered to be the principal issues in case the one or the other party carries the prize; and, indeed, having got the information thereof, I could not forbear to exclaim, "But, my God, all these questions together cannot outweigh the all-overruling importance of foreign policy!" It is there, in the question of foreign policy, that the heart of the next future throbs. Security and danger, developing prosperity, and its check, peace and war, tranquillity and embarrassment,— yes, life and death will be weighed in the scale of foreign policy! It is evident things are come to the point where they have been in ancient Rome, when old Cato never spoke privately or publicly, about whatever topic, without closing his speech with these words, "However, my opinion is that Carthage must be destroyed," — thus advertising his countrymen that there was one question outweighing in importance all other questions, from which public attention should never for a moment be withdrawn. Such, in my opinion, is the condition of the world now. Carthage and Rome had no place on earth together. Republican America and all-overwhelming Russian absolutism cannot much longer subsist together on earth. Russia active,— America passive,— there is an immense danger in that fact. It is like the avalanche in the Alps, which the noise of a bird's wing may move and thrust down with irresistible force, growing every moment. I cannot but believe it were highly time to do as old Cato did, and finish every speech with these words, "However, the law of nations should be maintained, and absolutism not permitted to become omnipotent." I could not forbear to make these remarks, and the answer I got was, "That is all true and all right, and will be attended to when the election is over; but, after all, the party must come into power, and you know there are so many considerations,— men want to be managed, and even prejudices spared, and so forth." And it is true, but it is sorrowful that it is true. That reminds me of what, in Schiller's "Maria Stuart," Mortimer says to Lord Leicester, the all-mighty favorite of Elizabeth, "O God, what

little steps has such a great lord to go at this court!" There is the first obstacle I have to meet with. This consolation, at least, I have,— that the chief difficulty I have to contend with is neither lasting, nor an argument against the justice of my cause or against the righteousness of my principles. Just as the calumnies by which I am assailed can but harm my own self, but cannot impair the justice of my country's cause or weaken the propriety of my principles, so that difficulty, being just a difficulty and no argument, cannot change the public opinion of the people, which always cares more about principles than about wire-pullings.

The second difficulty I have to contend with is rather curious. Many a man has told me that, if I had only not fallen into the hands of the Abolitionists and Free-soilers, he would have supported me; and, had I landed somewhere in the South instead of New York, I would have met quite different things from that quarter. But, being supported by the Free-soilers, of course I must be opposed by the South. On the other side I received a letter from which I beg leave to quote a few lines: "You are silent on the subject of slavery. Surrounded as you have been by slaveholders ever since you put your foot on English soil, if not during your whole voyage from Constantinople,— and ever since you have been in this country surrounded by them whose threats, promises, and flattery make the stoutest hearts succumb,— your position has put me in mind of a scene described by the apostle of Jesus Christ when the devil took him up into a high mountain," etc. Now, gentlemen, thus being charged from one side with being in the hands of Abolitionists, and from the other side with being in the hands of the slaveholders, I indeed am at a loss what course to take, if these very contradictory charges were not giving me the satisfaction to feel that I stand just where it is my duty to stand, on a truly American ground.

I must beg leave to say a few words in that respect,— the more because I could not escape vehement attacks for not committing myself, even in that respect, with whatever interior party question. I claim the right for my people to regulate its own domestic concerns. I claim this as a law of nations, common to all humanity; and, because common to all, I claim to see them protected by the United States, not only because they have the power to defend what despots dare offend, but also because it is the necessity of their position to be a power on

earth, which they would not be if the law of nations can be changed, and the general condition of the world altered, without their vote. Now, that being my position and my cause, it would be the most absurd inconsistency if I would offend that principle which I claim and which I advocate.

And, O my God, have I not enough sorrows and cares to bear on these poor shoulders? Is it not astonishing that the moral power of duties, and the iron will of my heart, sustain yet this shattered frame? that I am desired yet to take up additional cares? If the cause I plead be just, if it be worthy of your sympathy, and at the same time consistent with the impartial considerations of your own moral and material interests, — which a patriot never should disregard, not even out of philanthropy,— then why not weigh that cause with the scale of its own value, and not with a foreign one? Have I not difficulties enough to contend with, that I am desired to increase them yet with my own hands? Father Mathew goes on preaching temperance, and he may be opposed or supported on his own ground; but whoever imagined opposition to him because, at the same time, he takes not into his hands to preach fortitude or charity? And, indeed, to oppose or to abandon the cause I plead only because I mix not with the agitation of an interior question is a greater injustice yet, because to discuss the question of foreign policy I have a right. My nation is an object of that policy. We are interested in it. But to mix with interior party movements I have no right, not being a citizen of the United States.

The third difficulty which I meet, so far as I am told, is the opposition of the commercial interest. I have the agreeable duty to say that this opposition, or, rather, indifference, is only partial. I have met several testimonials of the most generous sympathy from gentlemen of commerce. But if, upon the whole, it should be really true that there is more coolness, or even opposition, in that quarter than in others, then I may say that there is an entire misapprehension of the true commercial interests in it. I could say that it would be strange to see commerce, and chiefly the commerce of a republic, indifferent to the spread of liberal institutions. That would be a sad experience, teeming with incalculable misfortunes, reserved to the nineteenth century. Until now history has recorded that "commerce has been the most powerful locomotive of principles and the most fruitful ally of civilization, intelligence, and

of liberty." It was merchants whose names are shining with immortal lustre from the most glorious pages of the golden books of Venice, Genoa, etc. Commerce, republican commerce, raised single cities to the position of mighty powers on earth, and maintained them in that proud position for centuries; and surely it was neither indifference nor opposition to republican principles by which they have thus ennobled the history of commerce and of humanity. I know full well that, since the treasures of commerce took their way into the coffers of despotism, in the shape of eternal loans, and capital began to speculate upon the oppression of nations, a great change has occurred in that respect.

But, thanks to God, the commerce of America is not engaged in that direction, hated by millions, cursed by humanity. Her commerce is still what it was in former times,—the beneficent instrumentality of making mankind partake of all the fruits and comforts of the earth and of human industry. Here it is no paper speculation upon the changes of despotism; and, therefore, if the commercial interests of republican America are considered with that foresighted sagacity, without which there is no future and no security in them, I feel entirely sure that no particular interest can be more ambitious to see absolutism checked and freedom and democratic institutions developed in Europe than the commerce of republican America. It is no question of more or less profit, it is a question of life and death to it. Commerce is the heel of Achilles, the vulnerable point of America. Thither will, thither must be aimed the first blow of victorious absolutism. The instinct of self-preservation would lead absolutism to strike that blow if its hatred and indignation would not lead to it. Air is not more indispensable to life than freedom and constitutional government in Europe to the commerce of America.

Though many things which I have seen have, upon calm reflection, induced me to raise an humble word of warning against materialism, still I believe there was more patriotic solicitude than reality in the fact that Washington and John Adams, at the head of the war department, complained of a predominating materialism (they styled it avarice) which threatened the ruin of America. I believe that complaint would, even to-day, not be more founded than it was in the infant age of your republic. Still, if there be any motive for that complaint of your purest and best patriots,—

if the commerce of America would know, indeed, no better guiding star than only the momentary profit of a cargo just floating over the Atlantic, — I would be even then at a loss how else to account for the indifference of the commerce of America in the cause of European liberty than by assuming that it is believed the present degraded condition of Europe may endure, if only the popular agitations are deprived of material means to disturb that which is satirically called tranquillity.

But such a supposition would, indeed, be the most obnoxious, the most dangerous fallacy. As the old philosopher, being questioned how he could prove the existence of God, answered, "By opening the eyes," just so nothing is necessary but to open the eyes in order that men of the most ordinary common sense become aware of it, that the present condition of Europe is too unnatural, too contrary to the vital interests of the countless millions, to endure even for a short time. A crisis is inevitable. No individual influence can check it; no indifference or opposition can prevent it. Even men like myself, concentrating the expectations and confidence of oppressed millions in themselves, have only just enough power, if provided with the requisite means, to keep the current in a sound direction, so that in its inevitable eruption it may not become dangerous to social order, which is indispensable to the security of person and property, without which especially no commerce has any future at all. And that being the unsophisticated condition of the world, and a crisis being inevitable, I indeed cannot imagine how those who desire nothing but peace and tranquillity can withhold their helping hands, that the inevitable crisis should not only be kept in a sound direction, but also carried down to a happy issue, capable to prevent the world from boiling continually, like a volcano, and insuring a lasting peace and a lasting tranquillity, never possible so long as the great majority of nations are oppressed, but sure so soon as the nations are content; and content they can only be when they are free. Indeed, if reasonable logic has not yet forsaken the world, it is the men of peace, it is the men of commerce, to the support of whom I have a right to look. Others may support my cause out of generosity,— these must support me out of considerate interest; others may oppose me out of egotism,— American commerce, in opposing me, would commit suicide.

Gentlemen, of such narrow nature are the considerations

which oppose my cause. Of equally narrow, inconsistent scope are all the rest, with the enumeration of which I will not abuse your kind indulgence. Compare with them the broad basis of lofty principles upon which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts took its stand in bestowing the important benefit of its support to my cause, and you cannot forbear to feel proudly that the spirit of old Massachusetts is still alive, entitled to claim that right in the councils of the united republic which it had in the glorious days when, amid dangers, wavering resolutions, and partial despondency, Massachusetts took boldly the lead to freedom and independence.

Those men of immortal memory, who within these very walls lighted with the heavenly spark of their inspiration the torch of freedom in America, avowed for their object the welfare of mankind; and, when you raised the monument of Bunker Hill, it was the genius of freedom thrilling through the heart of Massachusetts which made one of your distinguished orators say that the days of your ancient glory will continue to rain influence on the destinies of mankind to the end of time. It is upon this inspiration I rely, in the name of my down-trodden country,— to-day the martyr of mankind, to-morrow the battle-field of its destiny. Time draws nigh when either the influence of Americans must be felt throughout the world or the position abandoned to which you rose with gigantic vitality out of the blood of your martyrs. I have seen the genius of those glorious days spreading its fiery wings of inspiration over the people of Massachusetts. I feel the spirit of olden times moving through Faneuil Hall. Let me cut short my stammering words. Let me leave your hearts alone with the inspiration of history. Let me bear with me the heart-strengthening conviction that I have seen Boston still a radiating sun, as it was of yore, but risen so high on mankind's sky as to spread its warning rays of elevated patriotism far over the waves. American patriotism of to-day is philanthropy for the world.

Gentlemen, I trust in God, I trust in the destinies of humanity, and intrust the hopes of oppressed Europe to the consistent energy of Massachusetts.

KOSSUTH'S SPEECH AT CONCORD, MAY 11, 1852.

I am afraid to speak here. I like to listen to the tale the spirits of martyrs tell, and to words like yours, sir [Mr. Emerson],* full of wisdom and philanthropy. The answer I can give will scarcely possess the merit to satisfy the American people. One thing I may assume, and one thing own. Should the Almighty give me prosperity, yet in my life it would not carry me away, not to be frank, not only in adversity, but in duty, which is a good guard as well against ambition in prosperity as in adversity. One thing I may own,—that it is, indeed, true, everything good has yet been in the minority. Still mankind went on, and is going on, to that destiny the Almighty designed, when all good will not be confined to the minority, but will prevail amongst all mankind.

I hail thee, hallowed ground of Concord, thou sacred baptistry, where the people of America first baptized itself to the name of a "nation" with its own and its enemies' blood! I hail thee, Concord, thou John the Baptist of American Independence! "When invaded by oppression, resistance becomes the Christian and social duty of each individual." Thus spoke the leaders of Massachusetts when the spirit of national freedom first moved through this air which I now breathe. It was here that word was bravely redeemed by a people transformed into heroes by the charm of liberty. The leaders swore "never to yield, but, with a proper sense of dependence on God, to defend those rights which Heaven gave, and no one ought to take." It was here that oath first was made good. Be thou blessed forever, hallowed ground of Concord! and, ye spirits of the departed, take up, upon good angelic wings, the prayers of the poor wandering exile, who, on the hallowed ground of Concord, invokes the young spirit of the New World to regenerate the Old!

Gentlemen, remember what had to pass in the Old World that Hungary's exiled chief thus might be standing on Concord's hallowed ground, and that such prayers fall from his lips from such a place. Oh, silence for a while the noble pride of your prosperity, and bow with reverence before the finger of God! He is the God of all humanity. What he did for you he meant to do for humanity. Concord became the preface of liberty in America, that America might become the preface of liberty on earth. That is my faith. I have drawn this faith from the philosophy of your history.

It is strange, indeed, how every incident of the present bears the mark of deeper meaning around me. It is a meaning in the very fact that it is you, sir, by whom the representative of Hungary's ill-fated struggle is so generously welcomed, in the name of Concord, to the shrine of martyrs illumined by victory. You are wont to dive into the mysteries of truth, and disclose mysteries of right to the eyes of men.

* The address of welcome at Concord had been made by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Your honored name is Emerson; and Emerson was the name of the man who, a minister of the gospel, turned out with his people on the 19th of April of eternal memory, when the alarm-bell first was rung. The words of an Emerson administered counsel and the comfort of religion to the distressed then, and the words of an Emerson now speak the comfort of philosophy to the cause of oppressed liberty. I take hold of that augury, sir. Religion and philosophy, you blessed twins, upon you I rely with my hopes to America. Religion, the philosophy of the heart, will make the Americans generous; and philosophy, the religion of the mind, will make the Americans wise; and all that I claim is a generous wisdom and a wise generosity.

Gentlemen, it would be evidently a mistake to believe that the Revolution of America was the accidental result of circumstances which England could have prevented. No, gentlemen, England could not have retained possession of this country, except only by transforming herself into a republic, or, at least, into a democratic monarchy. That would have been the only means to prevent the separation. Those acts of the British Parliament, which virtually repealed the charter of Massachusetts, those acts were, indeed, oppressive, arbitrary, and tyrannical. They would have, in every other portion of the world, justified a revolution; but here, in your country, those arbitrary acts of the government have been but an opportunity to assert with arms that national independence which, also, without that opportunity would have been asserted,— perhaps in a different way,— but would have been asserted, certainly, because it was a necessity,— not only a necessity with your own country, gentlemen, but a logical necessity in the progress of mankind's history. The arbitrary acts of the British government were a crime; but not to have understood that necessity, and not to have yielded to it by amicable arrangement without sacrifices, that was a fault.

In my opinion, there is not a single fact in history which would have been so distinctly marked to be providential, with reference to all humanity, as the colonization, revolution, and republicanism of the now United States of America. This immense continent being discovered and brought within the scope of European civilization, peopled with elements of that civilization, could not remain a mere appendix to Europe. That is evident. But this America, being connected as it is with Europe by a thousand social, moral, and material ties,— by the ties of blood, religion, language, science, civilization, and commerce,— to me it is equally evident that to believe that this so connected America can rest isolated in politics from Europe, that would be just such a fault as that was that England did not believe in time the necessity of America's independence.

Yes, gentlemen, this is so much true.— that I would pledge life, honor, and everything dear to man's heart and honorable to man's memory that either America must take its becoming part in the political regeneration of Europe or she herself must yield to the per-

nicious influence of European politics. There was never yet a more fatal mistake than it would be to believe that, by not caring about the political condition of Europe, America may remain unaffected by the condition of Europe. I could, perhaps, understand such an opinion if you would or could be entirely and in every respect isolated from Europe; but, as you are not isolated, as you cannot be, as you cannot even have the will to be isolated, because that very will would be a paradox, a logical absurdity, impossible to be carried out, being contrary to the eternal laws of God, which he for nobody's sake will change, therefore to believe that you can go on to be connected with Europe in a thousand respects and still remain unaffected by its social and political condition would be, indeed, a fatal aberration. You stretch your gigantic hands a thousand-fold every day over the waves. Your relations with Europe are not only commercial, as with Asia: they are also social, moral, spiritual, intellectual. You take Europe every day by the hand: how, then, could you believe that, if that hand of Europe, which you grasp every day, remains dirty, you can escape from seeing your own hands soiled? The more clean your hands are, the more will the filth of old Europe stick to them. There is no possible means to escape from being soiled, than to help us Europeans to wash the hands of our Old World. You have heard of the ostrich that, when persecuted by an enemy, it is wont to hide its head, leaving its body exposed. It believes that, by not regarding it, it will not be seen by the enemy. That curious aberration is worthy of reflection. It is typical. Yes, gentlemen, either America will regenerate the condition of the Old World or it will be degenerated by the condition of the Old World.

Sir, I implore you [Mr. Emerson] give me the aid of your philosophical analysis, to impress the conviction upon the public mind of your nation that the Revolution, to which Concord was the preface, is full of a higher destiny,— of a destiny broad as the world, broad as humanity itself. Let me entreat you to apply the analytic powers of your penetrating intellect to disclose the character of the American Revolution, as you disclose the character of self-reliance, of spiritual laws, of intellect, of nature, or of politics. Lend the authority of your judgment to the truth that the destiny of the American Revolution is not yet fulfilled: that the task is not yet completed: that to stop half-way is worse than would have been not to stir. Repeat those words of deep meaning which once you wrote about the monsters that look backward, and about the walking with reverted eye, while the voice of the Almighty says, "Up and onward forevermore," and while the instinct of your people, which never fails to be right, answered the call of destiny by taking for its motto the word "Ahead."

Indeed, gentlemen, the monuments you raised to the heroic martyrs who fertilized with their heart's blood the soil of liberty,— these monuments are a fair tribute of well-deserved gratitude, gratifying to

the spirits who are hovering around us, and honorable to you. Woe to the people which neglected to honor its great and good men! but believe me, gentlemen, those blest spirits would look down with saddened brows to this free and happy land if ever they were doomed to see that the happy inheritors of their martyrdom had the pretension to believe that the destiny to which that sacred martyr blood was sacrificed is accomplished, and its price fully paid, in the already achieved results, because the living generation dwells comfortably and makes two dollars out of one.

No, gentlemen, the stars on the sky have a higher aim than that to illumine the night-path of some lonely wanderer. The course your nation is called to run is not yet half performed. Mind the fable of Atalanta,— it was a golden apple thrown into her way which made her fall short in her race.

Two things I have met here, in these free and mighty United States, which I am at a loss how to make concord. The two things I cannot concord are: first, that all your historians, all your statesmen, all your distinguished orators, who wrote or spoke, characterize it as an era in mankind's destiny designed to change the condition of the world, upon which it will rain an ever-flowing influence. And, secondly, in contradiction to this universally adopted consideration, I have met in many quarters a propensity to believe that it is conservative wisdom not to take any active part in the regulation of the condition of the outward world. These two things do not concord. If that be the destiny of America which you all believe to be, then, indeed, that destiny can never be fulfilled by acting the part of passive spectators and by this very passivity granting a charter to ambitious czars to dispose of the condition of the world. I have met distinguished men trusting so much to the operative power of your institutions and of your example that they really believe they will make their way throughout the world merely by their moral influence. But there is one thing those gentlemen have disregarded in their philanthropic reliance, and that is that the ray of sun never yet made its way, by itself, through well-closed shutters and doors. They must be drawn open, that the blessed rays of the sun may get in. I have never yet heard of a despot who had yielded to the moral influence of liberty. The ground of Concord itself is an evidence of it. The doors and shutters of oppression must be opened by bayonets, that the blessed rays of your institutions may penetrate into the dark dwelling-house of oppressed humanity. . . .

I am an exile of the Old World, fraught with the hopes and expectations of oppressed millions. I may be excused for looking anxiously into the mysteries of your national existence if I could not find out there a flower of consolation to my poor native land, well deserving a better fate. But let me forsake that elevated position, and step down lower to the standing-place of your own national interests, of your own American policy. Even thus, I hope nobody

will contradict me, that in the life of a nation there are different periods equally necessary, of equally vital importance, if that nation desires to live. And it is but necessary to open their eyes, and to look to the condition of your glorious land, to become aware that now there is such a necessity for your future to be a power on earth, as it was necessary in 1775 to make a revolution, and to become independent and free. And I must say it, even at the risk of offending your national pride, that you are not yet a power on earth; and you will be no power on earth so long as you permit other powers to dispose of the laws of nations, and of the common interests of all humanity. And by not becoming a power on earth, when it is a necessity to do so, you lose, you must lose the glorious position you hold, because, as you well may see, the other powers of the earth dispose of the world's condition in a direction antagonistical to your interests,— in a direction in which your principles lose ground on earth instead of gaining ground, as you should.

There are men who believe the position of a power on earth will come to you by itself; but oh, do not trust to this fallacy! A position never comes by itself: it must be taken, and taken it never will be by passivity. The martyrs who have hallowed by their blood the ground of Concord trusted themselves, and occupied the place Divine Providence assigned them. Sir, the words are yours which I quote. You have told your people that they are now men, and must accept, in the highest mind, the same destiny,— that they are not minors and invalids in a protected corner, but guides, redeemers, and benefactors, advancing on chaos and on the dark. I pray God to give your people the sentiment of the truth you have taught. Your people, fond of its prosperity, loves peace. Well, who would not love peace? But allow me again, sir, to repeat, with all possible emphasis, the great words you spoke: "Nothing can bring you peace but a triumph of principles."

The people of America's instinct is with my prayers. It is with me once more your words, sir: "What your heart thinks great is great." The soul's emphasis is always right. To this I will trust; and, reminding you of the fact that in the soil of Concord the ashes of your martyrs are mingled in concord with the ashes of your enemies, and out of both liberty has grown, I say let this be an augury. Let the future be regulated, not by long past disinclinations, but by present necessities: not by anticipations of olden times, but by sympathies congenial to the present times; and let the word "Concord" be an augury to that fraternity amongst nations which will make the world free, and your nation the first and the greatest among the free.

KOSSUTH'S SPEECH AT PLYMOUTH, MAY 12, 1852.

. . . I am not here, gentlemen, to retell the Pilgrim Fathers' tale. I have to learn about it from your particulars, which historians neglect, but the people's heart by pious tradition likes to conserve. Neither am I here to tell how happy you are. That you feel. Pointed by that sentiment which instinctively rises in the heart of happy good men at the view of foreign misfortune, you invited me to this sacred spot, desiring to pour in my sad heart the consoling inspiration flowing from this place, and to strengthen me in the trust to God. I thank you for it. It does good to my heart. The very air which I here respire, though to me sad, because fresh with the sorrows of Europe and with the woes of my native land, that very air is a balm to the bleeding wounds of my soul. It relieves like as the tears relieve the oppressed heart. But this spot is a book of history. A book not written by man, but by the Almighty himself,— a leaf out of the records of destiny sent to earth and illumined by the light of heavenly intellect, that men and nations, reading in that book of life the bountiful intentions of the Almighty God, may learn the duties they are expected to fulfil, and cannot neglect to fulfil without offending those intentions with which the Almighty Ruler of human destinies has worked the wonders of which Plymouth Rock is the cradle-place. I feel like Moses, when he stood on Mount Nebo, in the mountains of Abarem, looking over the billows. I see afar the Canaan of mankind's liberty. I would the people of your great republic would look to Plymouth Rock as to a new Sinai, where the Almighty legislator revealed what he expects your nation to do and not do unto her neighbors, by revealing to her free America's destiny.

Who would have thought, gentlemen, that the modest vessel which two hundred and thirty-two years ago landed the handful of Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock was fraught with the palladium of liberty and with the elements of a power destined to regenerate the world? Oppression drove them from their ancient European home to the wilderness of an unknown world. The "Mayflower" developed into a wonderful tree of liberty. Where the wilderness stood, there now a mighty Christian nation stands, unequalled in general intelligence and in general prosperity, a glorious evidence of mankind's capacity to self-government: and ye, happy sons of those Pilgrim Fathers, it became your glorious destiny to send back an enchanted twig from your tree of freedom to the Old World, thus requiting the oppression which drove away your forefathers from it. Is the time come for it? Yes, it is. That which is a benefit to the world is a condition of your own security. . . .

What is it I claim from you, people of America,— ye powerful swarm from the beehive Europe, ye sons of the Pilgrims,— those

Christian Deucalions who peopled this New World, and founded a nation in seeking but the asylum of a new home? What is it I claim from you, people of America? Is it that you should send over yonder Atlantic a fleet of new "Mayflowers," manned with thousands of Miles Standishes? . . . Is it that which I claim, in the name of mankind's great family, of which you are a mighty, full-grown son? No, I claim not this. Do I claim from you to send over your sons to Hungary's border mountains to make a living fence by their breasts, catching up the blasting wind of Russia that it may not fall upon the poor, leaf-torn shrub of Hungary? No, I claim not this. Or do I claim from you to beat back the bloody hand of the Austrian, that he may not waste the tempest-torn shrub, and not drain the life-sweat of its nursing soil? No, I do not claim that.

What is it, then, I claim from America? That same violence which shattered Hungary's bush has loosened, has bent, has nearly broken the pole called law of nations, without which no right is safe and no nation sure,— none, were it even ten times so mighty as yours. I claim from America that it should fasten and make firm that pole called "law of nations," that we may with the nerve-strings of our own stout hearts bind to it our nation's shattered shrub. That is what I claim. And I ask you, in the name of the Almighty, is it too pretentious, is it too much arrogance to claim so much?

"In the law of nations every nation is just so much interested as every citizen in the laws of his country." That is a wise word. It is the word of Mr. Webster, who, I am sure of it, in the high position he holds, intrusted with your country's foreign policy, would readily make good his own word if only his sovereign, the nation, be decided to back it, and says to him, "Go on." . . .

To whom shall the oppressed turn for the protection of law and of right if not to those who have the power to protect that law and that right upon which their own power, their own existence, rests? Turn to God and trust to him, you say. Well, that we do. The Lord is our chief trust: but, precisely because we trust to God, we look around with confidence for the instrumentality of this protection. And who shall be that instrumentality if not you, people of America, for whom God has worked an evident wonder out, and upon this very place where I stand?

We may well praise the dignity of Carver and Bradford, the bravery of Standish, the devotion of Brewster, the enterprising spirit of Allerton, the unexampled fortitude and resignation of their women, the patience of their boys, the firmness, thoughtfulness, religious faith and confident boldness of all the Pilgrims of the "Mayflower." We may well praise that all, no praise is too high and none undeserved: but, after all, we must confess that the wonderful results of their pilgrimage,— the nation which we see here,— that is not their merit, as it could never have been the anticipation of their thoughts. No, that is no human merit: that is an evident miracle,— the work of God.

What have they been, those Pilgrims of those days? What was their resolution, their aim, their design? Let me answer in the eloquent words of Mr. Webster's last centennial address: "They have been the personification of humble and peaceable religion flying from causeless oppression, conscience attempting to escape from arbitrary rule, braving a thousand dangers to find here — what? A place of refuge and of rest." And what is it they have founded here? A mighty nation, of twenty-four millions, in the short period of two hundred and thirty-two years. Well, that has never entered the thoughts of the boldest of them.

The Revolution of 1775 was no miracle. It was a necessity,— an indication of your people's having come to the lawful age of a nation. Your assuming now the position of a power on earth, as I hope you will, that will again be no miracle. It would be wisdom but the wisdom of doing what is good to humanity and necessary to yourselves. But, the United States of America,— a result of the Pilgrim Fathers' landing on Plymouth's Rock,— that is no wisdom, no necessity: it is an evident miracle, a work of God. And believe me, gentlemen, the Almighty God never deviates from the common laws of eternity for particular purposes. He never makes a miracle but for the benefit of all the world. By that truth the destiny of America is appointed out, and every destiny implies a duty to fulfil. Happy the people which has the wisdom of its destiny and the resolution of its duties resulting therefrom. But woe to the people which takes not the place which Providence does appoint to it! With the intentions of Providence, and with the decrees of the Almighty, no man can dare to play. Self-reliance is a manly virtue, and no nation has a future which has not that virtue. But to believe that seventy-five years of prodigious growth dispense of every danger and of every care, that would be the surest way to provoke danger and to have much to care. You will judge by this, gentlemen, if it was too much boldness on my part to believe that it is your country's destiny to regenerate the world by maintaining the laws of nations, or too much boldness to claim that which I believe is your destiny. . . .

The visit of Kossuth to the United States, to plead for our interest in the cause of the independence of Hungary, in 1851–52, and the popular demonstration attending it, constitute perhaps the most impressive chapter in the history of the sympathy of our people for other peoples struggling for freedom. The advent of the American republic in history was as the morning star to lovers of liberty and democracy in Europe and throughout the world. It has been our greatest glory through the century that the workers for freedom and political progress everywhere have looked to us, and that our sympathy and help have gone out to them. We were the friends of Bolivar and the young South American republics; and the history of the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine will be remembered

(see Old South Leaflet, No. 56, on "The Monroe Doctrine"). The speeches of Webster, Clay, and others in behalf of the Greeks, at the time of their uprising against the Turks in 1824, should be read. Our sympathy went out to Garibaldi and Mazzini, as again and again to the republicans of France and of Germany, so many of whom, when fortunes were adverse, have found their homes among us. Our sympathy for the oppressed people of Cuba led ultimately to armed interference in their behalf. American influences have been second to no other in the political new birth of Japan; and the reformers in Servia and Bulgaria drew their inspiration largely from Robert College.

Kossuth arrived in America in December, 1851. He came as the guest of the nation. The President and Congress had officially declared their sympathy; and the Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, replying shortly before to the Austrian minister's remonstrances against our expressions of interest in the Hungarian cause, had firmly declared that no spectacle could ever enlist the sympathies of the American people more deeply than that of a nation struggling to maintain or gain its independence. Kossuth's reception in New York was something unparalleled in its enthusiasm, and this enthusiasm continued everywhere until his departure. His speech before the Corporation of New York, December 11, was perhaps the ablest and most comprehensive which he delivered, appealing to the utterances of Washington and the fathers as justification for the republic's active interest in the cause of freedom and self-government in all the world. This speech, together with the speeches in Philadelphia, Washington, etc., is printed in the appendix to Headley's Life of Kossuth. From Washington, Kossuth went to the West and the South; and in April, 1852, he came to New England, speaking to enormous crowds in Boston, New Haven, Springfield, Worcester, Lowell, and a score of places. There is a special volume, "Kossuth in New England," devoted to this visit, including the various addresses. Governor George S. Boutwell welcomed Kossuth to the State of Massachusetts, President Henry Wilson to the Senate, and Speaker N. P. Banks to the House of Representatives; and their speeches, as well as Kossuth's replies, should be read, as expressing the sentiment of the time. Kossuth made three speeches in Faneuil Hall, the first at a public meeting on the evening of April 20, the second at a legislative banquet on the following evening, the third on May 14. The first of these speeches is that here reprinted, together with the speeches at Concord and (in part) Plymouth. See Charles Sumner's speech, "Welcome to Kossuth" (Sumner's Works, iii. 3). This was Sumner's first speech in the Senate, Dec. 10, 1851. See also Sumner's letter on "Sympathy with the Rights of Men Everywhere" (Works, ii. 444).

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 011 802 427 8

PUBLISHED BY

THE DIRECTORS OF THE OLD SOUTH WORK,

Old South Meeting-house, Boston, Mass.